DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 303 743 CG 021 442

TITLE Nowhere to Turn: The Crisis in Middle School Guidance and Support.
INSTITUTION Interface, Inc., New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE Aug 88
NOTE 88p.
PUB TYPE Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Delivery Systems; Elementary Education; Financial Support; *Middle Schools; *School Guidance; Social Support Groups
IDENTIFIERS *New York (New York)

ABSTRACT

An Educational Priorities Panel publication in May 1988 reported that funding for guidance and support services in New York City's middle schools was inadequate to sustain an effective base of services to middle school students. This report builds upon that earlier research and investigates how current practices in eight middle schools reflect limited funding and an ineffective structure for delivery of services. In preparing this report, representative schools were selected for in-depth site visits which included interviews with principals, assistant principals, deans, guidance counselors, drug abuse counselors, school psychologists, social workers, educational evaluators, dropout prevention program facilitators, case managers and counselors, attendance teachers, and other staff involved in providing guidance and support services. In addition, panel researchers spoke with state and local education officials, students, and district staff. This report presents findings from the investigation, including a summary of the plight of eight case study schools selected for the investigation, general access to services in the areas of high school admissions, special education, and categorical programs and itinerant counseling. Conclusions are drawn concerning the access and delivery of services and recommendations are made to improve the structure and delivery of services. Personnel issues are addressed in the areas of recruitment, staffing, and staff development and coordination. Recommendations for personnel issues are made. A literature review is appended. (NB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

12-13-88

ED303743

NOWHERE TO TURN

THE CRISIS IN MIDDLE SCHOOL GUIDANCE AND SUPPORT

CG 021442

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
(Office of Educational Research and Improvement)
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robin Williams

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EDUCATIONAL PRIORITIES PANEL

Dr. Margaret Nuzum, Coordinator
(718) 788-3121

INTERFACE Staff

In New York City:
666 Broadway
New York, NY 10012
(212) 674-2127

In Albany:
119 Washington Avenue
Albany, NY 12210
(518) 463-4991

The Educational Priorities Panel

Dr. Margaret Nuzum
Coordinator

Advocates for Children
American Jewish Committee, New York Chapter
American Reading Council
ASPIRA of New York
Association for the Help of Retarded Children
Center for Public Advocacy Research
Citizens' Committee for Children of New York, Inc.
The City Club of New York
Community Council of Greater New York
Community Service Society
The Junior League of Brooklyn
The Junior League of New York City, Inc.
League of Women Voters of New York City
Metropolitan Council of New York, NAACP
National Black Child Development Institute, Inc.
New York Coalition of 100 Black Women
New York Urban Coalition
New York Urban League
Presbytery of New York City
PROGRESS, Inc.
Public Education Association
Resources for Children with Special Needs, Inc.
Rheedlen Foundation
United Neighborhood Houses
United Parents Associations
Women's City Club of New York

Support for the Educational Priorities Panel for 1987-88 has been provided by:

Aaron Diamond Foundation
American Express Foundation
Chase Manhattan Bank
Chemical Bank
Citibank
Edna McConnell Clark Foundation
Robert Sterling Clark Foundation
Consolidated Edison of New York
Fund for the City of New York
Leon Lowenstein Foundation, Inc.
Manufacturers Hanover Trust Company
Merrill Lynch & Company, Inc.
Metropolitan Life Foundation
Morgan Guaranty Trust Company
New York Community Trust
New York Foundation
New York Times Company Foundation, Inc.
Helena Rubinstein Foundation
The Salomon Foundation, Inc.
Scherman Foundation
Time Inc.
Uris Brothers Foundation

Management Staff - INTERFACE

666 Broadway, 8th Floor
New York, NY 10012
(212) 674-2121

Stanley S. Litow, Executive Director
Robin Willner, Staff Director
Lynn Yanis, Project Director

119 Washington Avenue
Albany, NY 12210
(518) 463-4991

Tina Kelley, Project Associate
Sandra Moore, Administrative Assistant

EDUCATIONAL
PRIORITIES
PANEL

Dr. Margaret Nuzum, Coordinator
(718) 768-3121

INTERFACE, Staff

In New York City
666 Broadway
New York, NY 10012
(212) 674-2121

In Albany
119 Washington Avenue
Albany, NY 12210
(518) 463-4991

NOWHERE TO TURN

The Crisis in Middle School
Guidance and Support

Project Director: Lynn Yanis
Staff Director: Robin Willner

August, 1988

MEMBERSHIP: Advocates for Children • The American Jewish Committee, New York Chapter • American Reading Council, Ltd. • ASPIRA of New York • Association for the Help of Retarded Children • Center for Public Advocacy Research • Citizens Committee for Children of New York, Inc. • The City Club of New York • Coalition of 100 Black Women • Community Council of Greater New York • Community Service Society • Junior League of Brooklyn • The Junior League of New York City, Inc. • League of Women Voters of the City of New York • Metropolitan Council of New York, NAACP • National Black Child Development Institute of New York • New York Urban Coalition • New York Urban League • Presbytery of New York City • PROGRESS, Inc. • Public Education Association • Resources for Children with Special Needs • Rheedlen Foundation • United Neighborhood Houses • United Parents Associations • Women's City Club of New York

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	Introduction	1
	1. Executive Summary	1
	2. Summary of Recommendations	8
II.	Case Studies	13
	Abstracts	17
	Summary of Case Studies	26
III.	General Access to Services	29
	1. High School Admissions	33
	Available Services	34
	High School Paperwork	36
	High School Transition and Dropouts	37
	2. Special Education	39
	Staffing Levels	39
	Inappropriate Referrals	41
	3. Categorical Programs and Itinerant Counseling	43
	Special Education Prevention	47
	Dropout Prevention	51
	Substance Abuse Prevention	55
	Bilingual Guidance and Support	57
	Other Categories of Need	60
	Conclusion: Access and Delivery of Services	63
	Recommendations: Structure and Delivery of Services	65
IV.	Personnel Issues	71
	Recruitment	71
	Staffing	74
	Staff Development and Coordination	76
	Recommendations: Personnel	76
	Appendix: Literature Review	78

I. INTRODUCTION

Concerned about scarcity and fragmentation of guidance and support services for young adolescents, the Educational Priorities Panel initiated a comprehensive investigation of these services in New York City's middle schools. In May 1988, the EPP published A Fiscal Review: Guidance and Support Services in the Middle Schools, which found that funding for guidance and support services was inadequate to sustain an effective base of services to middle school youngsters. This report builds upon that earlier research and investigates how current practices in eight middle schools reflect limited funding and an ineffective structure for delivery of services. Representative schools were selected for in-depth site visits, including interviews with principals, assistant principals, deans, guidance counselors, drug abuse counselors, school psychologists, social workers, educational evaluators, dropout prevention program facilitators, case managers and counselors, attendance teachers, and other staff involved in providing guidance and support services. Panel researchers also spoke with state and local education officials, students, and district staff to assure that specific findings were representative of circumstances throughout the city.

1. Executive Summary

As society and schools become increasingly aware of the impact of social, personal and family problems on young people's abilities to perform in school, a growing number of expectations and responsibilities are laid at the door of guidance. Neither the training, staffing levels, nor structure for delivery of school-based guidance

services equip counselors, however, to provide all of the services now designated as the province of guidance.

Student to staff ratios of over 700 to 1 render ongoing contact between counselors and students nearly impossible. But even if new hiring brought staff to student ratios to an acceptable level, the urgent needs of young people could not be met within the present structure for delivering guidance and support services. Guidance and support services are currently provided only from 8:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. on the 180 days each year that school is in session. But students and their parents need access to services throughout the day, into the evening and when school is out of session. Heavy burdens of paperwork significantly reduce the time counselors have available to meet with students; counselors are often completely inaccessible to students, spending entire days completing paperwork. Staffing levels, funding and target populations are differentiated among various programs, and discrete, uncoordinated programs all address different facets of student need. This fragmentation undermines school morale and subverts the efficacy of services that should recognize every child as a whole being whose academic and personal needs are intimately connected.

School-based guidance and support services encompass a wide range of activities, although no formal contract or job description outlines expectations for guidance counselors. Responsibilities include but are not limited to: academic guidance and planning and the paperwork attendant on it, high school application and articulation, course selection, small group and individual counseling sessions on personal and developmental adjustment, career and life

planning, and crisis intervention and follow-up in the areas of sexual abuse, family violence, and health crises. The counselor and/or principal determine which students a counselor sees and what services are provided; no expectation other than professional prerogative governs the prioritization or delivery of specific guidance services within a school. State regulations require only an annual review of students' educational progress, and often even this review does not occur.

The guidance and support function is especially school-specific, and organization of delivery varies greatly from school to school. The eight middle schools the Panel selected for in-depth study represent the diversity of size, location and demographic factors throughout the city (see Tables III and IV, pages 15-16), although they do not, of course, constitute a strictly scientific sampling. Study of representative schools documented a number of weaknesses leading an overall lack of effective guidance services:

- Citywide, general guidance and support services were painfully scarce. Middle school guidance staff to student ratios averaged 1:709 throughout the system in 1987-88. Ratios of bilingual guidance staff to Limited English Proficient students averaged 1 to over 2,000 citywide. Increased funding in fiscal year 1989 should bring average student to staff ratios in general education to 1:406, a point that is still more than 60 percent higher than the average for the rest of New York State (1:250) and the ratio recommended this year by the Board of Education's Middle Schools Task Force.

- In the eight representative middle schools the Panel visited, staff to student ratios averaged an impossibly high 1:788 in general education. Yet small numbers of students received guidance and support through special programs targeted to students at obvious risk of dropping out, special education referral, and drug and alcohol abuse, or to special education students whose individualized education plans require it. (In our sample, 17% of students received counseling through special programs. See Table I.)

School Year 1987-88

TABLE I

General Counseling Ratios

and

Students Receiving Supplemental Counseling Services Through Special Programs

School	Number of Students	Number of General Counselors and FTE's *	Ratio	Number of students receiving supplemental counseling through special programs: Special Education	ERSS**	AIDP or DPP	SAPIS***	Total	% of Total Register
A	538	.7	1:769	87	11	0	25	117	22%
B	662	.6	1:1103	105	15	150	0	175	26
C	682	1.0	1:682	75	10	0	0	85	12
D	770	2.0	1:385	75	0	132	0	207	27
E	559****	1.0	1:867	75	10	0	15	100	18
F	1,356	1.6	1:848	0	8	0	15	23	2
G	756	1	1:756	19	10	0	20	49	6
H	1,524	1.7	1:896	95	0	216	15	326	21
		Average Ratio	1:788					Average Percent Served	17%

* Full Time Equivalent figures represent full-time counselors, the part-time presence of itinerant counselors, and, when counselors are responsible for mandated special education counseling, the balance of counselors' caseloads available for general guidance and support services.

** Educationally Related Support Service (special education prevention) counseling occurs in 10-week renewable cycles. The numbers above represent the ERSS caseload at a single point in time. ERSS personnel provide consultation to school staff as well as direct counseling to students.

*** Substance Abuse Prevention and Intervention Services (SAPIS) include education and prevention as well as direct counseling and intervention services.

**** A recently opened school serving large numbers of students living in homeless shelters, group homes and publicly funded housing projects, School E's population almost doubled between the official October 1987 roster and the EPP's visit in April 1988.

Special program counseling should be supplemental to a base of general tax levy services, but services through special programs, in which caseloads are capped at 50, 75, or 150:1, often represent the only real counseling available in schools where ratios for general guidance and support services reach as high as over 1000:1.

- The high school application process consumed overwhelming quantities of middle school counselors' time. Student to staff ratios of several hundred to one meant that even graduating eighth grade students could never see their counselors for more than an average of 20 minutes between the start of school and the January admissions deadline. Heavy paperwork burdens impinged on available counseling time, and many graduating students never received counseling at all before filling in forms to apply to high school. Whenever counselors had responsibility for students in grades other than the graduating class, counselors' involvement with the high school application process meant that younger students had virtually no access to services.

- Much of the paperwork relating to high school articulation and general recordkeeping is tedious, consisting of checking and rechecking data for errors. Yet licensed guidance counselors have no clerical support for their work. As a result, everyone loses: counselors are tied up with paperwork and unable to use their professional skills and training to support their students, while students and their parents, greatly in need of counseling support, cannot get access to counselors who are buried in paperwork.

- In some cases, new counseling staff are unfamiliar even with the basic rules and expectations governing guidance and support issues. Scarcity of time, personnel and resources means that most schools provide no staff development activities. Lack of staff development, professional support and processes for case referral and case management often crippled the efficacy of systems for guidance and support services. Staff development is necessary for inexperienced counselors who are new to the school, experienced counselors who may not be familiar with new procedures or comfortable with some issues that arise among adolescents today, and all school personnel who provide formal and informal counsel to students.

- Most school-based guidance and support services are only available when school is in session: from 8:30 to 3:00 180 days a year. But students need personal and academic counseling at other times of the day, and students and their parents need access to services throughout the day, into the evening, and when school is out of session.

- Although other publicly funded agencies near city schools often provide services to adolescents in the areas of family violence, sexual abuse, health and personal and developmental counseling, systems for referral or coordination between schools and community-based organizations are virtually nonexistent. Procedures and relationships for referral and follow-up rarely exist between school guidance offices and community-based organizations.

- Pursuant to legal mandates and their individual assessments, many special education students are entitled to receive support services in their schools, and special education caseloads have been legally capped at 75:1. Special education caseloads do not restrict general education students' access to services, as the classification of special education students as "mandated for services" should drive the hiring of additional special education service providers at the rate of 1:75. But the relative size of special education caseloads and general education caseloads, which are not legally determined and usually reach several hundred points out how limited is student access to services in general education. If the courts have found that the full-time efforts of one professional are necessary to guide 75 special education students through their personal and academic choices, how much ongoing guidance and support can another professional, in a similar environment, realistically provide to several hundred students?

- In a growing number of city schools, both special education and general education counselors work with both populations of students. But this redistribution of a painfully inadequate resource -- guidance -- merely rearranges the scarcity of guidance support services; it does not address it any way. When every counselor in a school has a legally mandated caseload of students who must be seen before the counselor is available to other students, general access to services is severely limited.

- The racial, cultural and linguistic backgrounds of guidance providers bears nearly no representative relationship to the student body. Throughout the city, 70 percent of students are black and Latino, yet only 16 percent of guidance personnel are people of color. The disparity between the backgrounds of staff and students is especially overwhelming in the area of guidance and support, yet no staff development helps support multicultural sensitivity among guidance personnel, and no ongoing training exists to help guidance providers understand and successfully mediate intergroup dynamics in city schools.

- Limited English Proficient students have virtually no access to guidance and support services. Many schools house no counselor able to communicate with LEP students and their parents. In other schools, a special education counselor with a full legal caseload, or a general education counselor with a caseload of several hundred, might also be bilingual -- but if these already burdened counselors cannot squeeze out extra time to meet with limited English proficient students and their families, then language minority students and parents have nowhere else to go.

- The availability of guidance and support services for special education students, when juxtaposed with the scarcity of services for general education youngsters, often leads to inappropriate referrals to special education. School psychologists, social workers and educational evaluators all observed that students are sometimes referred for special education simply so they might receive the ongoing support that is unavailable to them through any other avenue.

- School-Based Support Teams (SBSTs), comprised of a school psychologist, social worker and an educational evaluator, are present in all schools on at least a part-time basis, but their role as service providers is severely limited. SBSTs are required only to conduct special education evaluations: new referrals to special education, triennial evaluations, and other special education evaluations requested by the school. Staffing levels for SBST's ensure that evaluations consume all of SBST's time, and team members are not available to provide other services to students. Thus the majority of students are unaffected by the presence of trained support providers like SBST social workers and psychologists in their schools.

- In some cases, guidance and support services are emphasized in school staffing decisions, and staffing levels and coordination of services are enhanced in these schools. Overall scarcity of funding for non-instructional personnel, however, means that enhanced guidance services must be bought at the expense of other critical support services.

- A lack of definition between personal and academic counseling means that many students receive academic guidance about high school articulation or middle school course selection, but receive no personal guidance to ensure that high school applications or course selections are linked to the student's goals and interests. In some instances, students' emotional needs are so demanding that they are offered personal counseling, but personal counseling is usually bought at the expense of academic support and guidance. Lack of clarity about the multiple meanings of school-based guidance

means that student's needs in one area are often sacrificed at the expense of other equally important and related areas.

- Most schools have no processes to coordinate services provided through different school-based programs. School-based guidance and support services may include personnel responding to different supervisors, a range of methodologies, and different staff who may be present in a school on only certain days each week. Without coordination, much of the benefit of multiple programming is lost; students may be grossly underserved and fall through the cracks between several uncoordinated programs, or they may be pulled out of many different classes by different care providers and subjected to different and confusing counsel. Without an established process for coordination and case management, multiple programs offering guidance and support services do not yield significant improvement in student access to services.

- Differences in methodology, program definition, credentials, salary, material supports and size of staff caseloads often create competition, mistrust territoriality and resentment between various programs providing services to youngsters. These and other impediments to effective delivery of services usually go unaddressed at the school and the central level.

- In an effort to distribute guidance and support services to a greater number of students, itinerant counselors visit many different schools each week. Itinerant counselors may provide services through special education, general education, or a range of categorical or special subject programs. Itinerant delivery model is highly inefficient: coordination of services is rarely even attempted when providers are only present a few days each week; many school faculty do not know when itinerant counselors are present in their schools; itinerant counselors are rarely afforded professional respect, private offices or access to telephones and other necessary supports in the schools they visit; and students have, by definition, no access to itinerant counselors for several days each week. Itinerant counseling maximizes the burdens of paperwork and complicates supervision and accountability without yielding concomitant improvement in students' access to services.

2. Summary of Recommendations:

In conjunction with the central reorganization of the guidance services unit planned for 1988, profound review and restructure of guidance and support services at the school level is necessary to improve the delivery of school-based guidance and support services.

As new monies are allocated to guidance and support in 1988-89, funding must support improved structures to provide guidance to young people. Based on a full analysis of service delivery and access in the city's middle schools, the Educational Priorities Panel recommends that the crisis in guidance and support services be addressed in the following ways: (For full text of recommendations, see pages 65-70, 76-77).

1. Enhanced funding for services must be paired with profound review at the district, central and school levels, preferably at a special planning session convened for this purpose. The new funding for middle school guidance that has been included in the budget for the 1988-89 school year must be used as leverage for change at every level in the system for guidance and support services. A range of different models -- from group guidance programmed into the students' school day, to guidance providers working as school-wide staff developers, to the development of a new job title for counselors who report to principals but work beyond the school day -- must be reviewed in the summer of 1988. (See suggestions pp. 65-66.) A variety of delivery models should be explored in schools throughout the system in school year 1988-89 so that schools can further develop the models that are most effective for them.

2. The central Board of Education should coordinate state and city funding for categorical programs, enabling entire buildings with large concentrations of at-risk students, rather than discrete numbers of students within each school building, to be targeted with special supports for at-risk populations. (p. 65)

3. School-based administrators and guidance providers must work together to ensure that guidance and support services are delivered and coordinated in a comprehensive manner. Strong guidance and support service teams including all school-based guidance providers should develop clear roles, responsibilities and structures for case management and referral. At least one staff member should be designated to develop a referral network and linkages with community resources for guidance and support services. A coordinator for each school's guidance and support team should be responsible for recognizing and addressing impediments to integration of all services into a comprehensive case management service delivery model. (pp. 66-67)

4. Districts' hiring and organization of guidance system should improve all students' access to services by providing clerical support for guidance functions and hiring a range of new guidance and support staff, including new non-pedagogical staff. Services must be available in the languages students speak in their schools, and services should be available from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. year round. Guidance and support personnel should present guidance lessons directly in the classroom, on occasion, and a number of guidance and support issues should be integrated into the curriculum. Supervised peer counseling should be developed at the middle school level and programmed into the school day. Teachers should be explicitly encouraged to consider counseling as possibly appropriate for unusually quiet students as well as disruptive youngsters. (pp. 67-68)

5. School administrators or staff should designate one staff member in each school whose primary mission is high school articulation. The High School Division must offer training about high school selection and articulation directly to middle school staff, and many components of high school articulation should be integrated into the middle school curriculum. All schools should offer evening workshops on high school admissions and articulation stressing parent participation. Big sister/big brother programs should be established to help students navigate the transition to high school. (pp. 68-70)

6. School-Based Support Team members should target the reduction of inappropriate referrals to special education. Funding, staff development and integration of services should recognize the prevention of unecessary referrals to special education as central to a school's well-being. (p. 70)

7. Dropout prevention initiatives should be as comprehensive as possible in all schools. The AIDP and DPP programs should disseminate models for comprehensive programming throughout the system, and key decisions about dropout prevention programs must be made at the school level. (p. 70)

8. The central administration should develop a new job title and hire guidance and support staff who are not tied to the school's hours of 8:30 to 3:00. The hiring of new guidance and support staff should strive to make services available to students and their families beyond the days and hours that school is in session. (pp. 76-77)

9. The Division of Personnel, districts and schools must make every effort to recruit and hire bilingual and bicultural professionals and paraprofessionals.

10. The central Division of Personnel must significantly increase hiring and staff development for guidance and support service providers with a range of different educational and professional backgrounds. Staff development for all school personnel should involve training and sensitivity about guidance and support issues, and staff development should ensure that all personnel serving guidance functions are sensitive to multicultural issues and free from race, sex, class and disability bias. (p. 76-77)

These changes in the conception organization and staffing of guidance and support services would vitalize crucial support services in our schools, ensuring that all students will have a real opportunity to stay in school and learn and grow to their fullest potential.

II. CASE STUDIES

Although grade configuration varies throughout New York City's 178 middle schools, two patterns predominate: 33 percent are intermediate schools, serving grades 6-8, and 39 percent are junior high schools serving grades 7-9 (see Table II). The Panel selected eight schools -- four intermediate and four junior high schools -- for comprehensive site visits. These schools represent the demographic variety of the full range of city middle schools (see Table III). Selected schools range in size from enrollments of 532 to a high of 1,524. Percentages of designated Limited English Proficient (LEP) students range from 2 percent to 25.5 percent; percentages of special education students range from 1.9 percent to 22.1 percent; average daily attendance runs from a low of 73.4 percent to a high of 91 percent; and percentages of students reading at or above grade level range from 32.2 to 84.6 percent. A number of other salient factors were also represented by selected schools. (See Table IV.)

The structure of guidance delivery systems in New York City is complex, involving varying delivery models for general and special education students, itinerant counselors who report to supervisors far removed from the daily operation of a school, varying emphases on personal and academic counseling, and the shuffling of halves, quarters, and percents of counselors to different schools on various days of the week. The crisis in middle school guidance and support is best understood and represented through extended case study.

TABLE II

SUMMARY BACKGROUND DATA ON MIDDLE SCHOOLS

1987

Grade Organization	Number of Schools		Total Register	% of Minority Students	% LEP	% Free Lunch Entitled	% Special Education	% Daily Attendance	% DRP at or Above Grade Level
5-6	1		642	99.7	16.0	91.9	3.0	85.3	51.3
5-8	15	Minimum	188	37.2	0.2	19.7	1.9	80.3	36.4
		Maximum	1,371	100.0	23.8	100.0	19.0	93.2	97.6
		Mean	864	87.6	6.3	61.5	8.5	87.9	71.0
5-9	1		679	99.4	14.6	48.7	26.7	74.6	28.3
6-8	59	Minimum	420	4.3	0.2	5.4	1.3	73.4	29.3
		Maximum	2,070	100.0	35.4	97.9	31.5	93.5	91.7
		Mean	1,042	79.5	9.5	58.8	9.9	86.2	59.7
6-9	23	Minimum	417	15.8	0.7	42.9	0.1	81.1	41.7
		Maximum	2,196	100.0	19.5	91.0	20.8	91.5	75.5
		Mean	1,216	74.7	9.6	62.5	8.2	85.8	61.6
7-8	9	Minimum	515	51.6	0.7	36.3	5.4	80.9	51.9
		Maximum	1,429	100.0	13.2	83.0	21.2	91.2	86.1
		Mean	841	87.0	5.8	57.9	11.9	85.1	64.0
7-9	70	Minimum	386	3.8	0.1	14.3	1.9	67.4	33.0
		Maximum	1,821	100.0	37.2	100.0	22.1	94.3	96.6
		Mean	1,004	73.0	7.5	52.5	10.1	86.0	69.5
Total	178	Minimum	188	3.8	0.1	5.4	0.1	67.4	28.3
		Maximum	2,196	100.0	37.2	100.0	31.5	94.3	97.6
		Mean	1,020	77.6	8.3	57.1	9.8	86.1	64.7
		Median		92.9	6.8	59.6	9.6	86.7	64.0

TABLE III

SUMMARY BACKGROUND DATA FOR ALL MIDDLE SCHOOLS
1987

	Total Register	% of Minority Students	% LEP	% Free Lunch Entitled	% Special Education	% Daily Attendance	% DRP at or Above Grade Level
Minimum	188	3.8	0.1	5.4	0.1	67.4	28.3
Maximum	2,196	100.0	37.2	100.0	31.5	94.3	97.6
Mean	1,020	77.6	8.3	57.1	9.8	86.1	64.7
Median		92.9	6.8	59.6	9.6	86.7	64.0

SELECTED SCHOOLS

School	Grade Organization	Total Registration	% of Minority Students	% LEP	% Free Lunch Entitled	% Special Education	% Daily Attendance	% DRP at or Above Grade Level
A	7-9	538	98.9	25.5	79.0	22.1	81.4	47.7
B	6-8	662	99.4	16.9	86.0	19.2	81.7	32.2
C	7-9	682	63.8	3.5	27.4	11.9	89.3	82.3
D	6-8	770	98.3	20.5	71.2	5.3	82.4	56.5
E	6-8	559	99.8	2.0	61.5	20.4	73.4	43.2
F	7-9	1,356	99.8	4.1	66.2	2.3	89.3	81.8
G	7-9	756	56.3	6.2	29.9	1.9	91.0	84.6
H	6-8	1,524	95.3	8.7	61.2	7.3	83.8	57.6

TABLE IV

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	SCHOOL
7-9	7-9	6-8	6-8	6-8	7-9	7-9	6-8	GRADE ORGANIZATION
M	M	BX	BX	BK	BK	Q	Q	BOROUGH
		X	X				X	AI/DP OR DPP SCHOOL

LOW	MID	HIGH	
B, E, F	G, H	A, C, D	% LEP
A, B, C, E		F, H	REGISTER
B, G	E, H	A, C	% FREE LUNCH
A, C	D, H	B, G	% DRP ON OR ABOVE GRADE LEVEL
E	D, H	B, F, G	% DAILY ATTENDANCE
B, G		A, C, D, E, F	% MINORITY STUDENTS
F, G	D, H	B, G	% SPECIAL EDUCATION

MSG-2/5

Case Studies: Abstracts

The EPP encountered some middle school staff who met the highest standards of professionalism, innovation, and dedication in their work. In some cases, however, individuals were overwhelmed by the size of their caseloads and the depth of systemic problems affecting their students; service providers were severely overtaxed and painfully isolated. Although we found commitment and creativity in guidance and support services in New York City's middle schools, impossibly high student to staff ratios and devastating lacks of professional staff development and schoolwide coordination crippled service effectiveness in too many cases.

The eight case studies that follow represent observations and findings from middle schools throughout the city. These case studies are offered in the ethnographic spirit of presenting the words, observations and impressions of people in the field to illuminate the analysis.

School A

The smallest school in the study maintains one special education social worker and one general education guidance counselor for 538 students. Even in this small school, however, a majority of students receive no personal counseling and little informed guidance concerning academic preparation and high school selection, application and articulation.

The number of special education students mandated for counseling often exceeds the legal limit of a single special education counselor's caseload (75), and, in this school where over 22 percent of students are classified in special education, many handicapped and emotionally disturbed youngsters are currently waitlisted for services. Furthermore, the special education social worker is the only member of the school's professional guidance and support staff

who can speak Spanish. Thus, in a Lower East Side school where over one-quarter of students are designated limited English proficient and an estimated 90 percent of students speak Spanish in their homes, the only counselor able to communicate with over one-quarter of the students and a majority of parents is already burdened with a full legal caseload and a waiting list of maximum priority.

Two deans and two assistant principals are available to, in addition to their general administrative duties, address the immediate needs of students whose behavior disrupts the school day. They do not have the time or training, however, to counsel students in depth or speak with students or their parents on any but an emergency basis.

The single general education guidance counselor is responsible for all of the academic and personal counseling needs of 6 special education students mandated for weekly or biweekly counseling, 11 students referred for 10-week cycles of special education prevention counseling, and more than 460 seventh, eighth and ninth graders in general education. He also leaves school A one day each week to provide counseling to 15 special education students in another school. He is burdened, however, not just with the size of his caseload but with a lack of experience and competence in the job. When the Panel's researcher inquired about high school programs and co-curricular activities advertised by posters in his own office, he was unfamiliar with and unable to comment on the programs. More than one staff member sought the researcher out specifically to mention that "the person they call a guidance counselor knows less about high school programs than you or I." The counselor has only been working in school A since September, yet he has received no technical assistance or staff development to address his obvious lack of experience.

School A also houses a number of counselors who report to supervisors outside of the school. A substance abuse counselor, employee of a district program funded by the State Department of Substance Abuse Services (DSAS), counsels 25 students referred for intervention services and works with other students on skits, peer leadership activities and recreation. His services are not integrated in any way into the rest of the school's functioning, however. This counselor bragged that he did not even know where the guidance counselor's office was located; he noted, with several students present, that the students he sees do not trust anyone besides him in the school, "and I don't blame them." Other staff referred to the drug counselor's lack of license, credentials, and professionalism as impediments to referral and coordination.

Another counselor visits school A one or two days weekly to perform special education preventive counseling, also funded through the state, and yet another counselor works on a per diem basis from 3:15 to 5:15 with students in temporary housing who participate in an extended day program.

MSG-3/3

School B

School B, in which 86 percent of students are free lunch eligible and only 32 percent of students read at or above grade level, has a new principal this year who emphasizes the importance of guidance and support services. The school benefits from the coordination and dedication of all its guidance and support services providers through a Pupil Personnel Team with clear ladders of referral and processes for case management. It still suffers, however, from a scarcity of personnel that drives a crisis orientation in crucial services.

In school B, two counselors are available to work with a total of 662 students. But each counselor first has a caseload of over 50 special education students who are legally mandated to receive counseling. With a caseload of 52 students mandated to receive guidance and support services, one counselor admits he has virtually no time to see students who are referred for counseling by teachers or through the school's Pupil Personnel Team. Yet he is the only counselor with responsibility for the school's 170 graduating eighth graders. Furthermore, he is the only counselor, in a school with over 100 limited English proficient students, who speaks Spanish. A second counselor also has a caseload of 53 special education students legally mandated for counseling. Beyond this caseload, she is the only counselor responsible for the balance of the school's 450 sixth and seventh graders.

Special education caseloads, as mentioned earlier, are capped at 75. Thus each counselor in school B maintains 70 percent of a full caseload of students legally mandated for counseling, allowing the equivalent of 60 percent of a counselor (30% of each of two counselors' workloads) to deliver basic guidance and support services to all students in the school. The actual guidance staff:student ratio in general education in school B, then, soars to 1:1103.

A social worker funded through the State Educationally Related Support Services Aid (ERSSA) also visits school B two times a week; she sees 15 students targeted for special education prevention services, working with students for ten-week cycles. A SAPIS (Substance Abuse Prevention and Intervention Services) worker from the district substance abuse program had been present in the school but left three months prior to the EPP's visit and has not been replaced.

The mission and practices of an Attendance Improvement/Dropout Prevention (AI/DP) program are well understood and integrated into the functioning of the school and its Pupil Personnel Team. An extended school day, for example, funded through AI/DP, allows 20 percent of participants to be non-AI/DP students, but staff all agree that the program is over-subscribed and overutilized. Attendance counseling, outreach and follow up, they feel, should be central to programming for the entire school.

School B benefits from a staff and administration who recognize adolescents' needs for guidance and support services and don't mind bending a number of rules to meet them. A school psychiatrist, for example, in addition to his responsibilities as an evaluator of special education students, participates in overall case management through the Pupil Personnel Team. He also counsels the large number of students with serious emotional needs -- youngsters whose parents are dying, teenagers who have threatened or attempted suicide -- who cannot be seen by counselors who are already overloaded with special and academic counseling responsibilities. However, in order to meet court mandates to complete evaluations, the limited staff of School Based Support Teams (SBST), including the school psychiatrists, are supposed to engage in evaluative work only. Thus, his participation in case management and direct counseling, necessary though it is to the coordination and effectiveness of school guidance and support services, must be conducted off the record.

Similarly, a school-based attendance coordinator who monitors and follows up on student attendance from school breakfast participation through after-school programming has brought four percent points of improvement in schoolwide attendance rates since February. But this service, widely recognized as crucial to every aspect of the school's functioning, is provided at the expense of full-time coverage of the school library. Funding is not available to support both a librarian and an attendance coordinator; this school has highlighted and benefited from enhanced attendance services, but to do so it has sacrificed the full-time professional services of a librarian.

School C

School C, also a small school but with an exceptionally high performance profile, houses two full-time guidance counselors and nearly 700 students. One counselor provides legally mandated counseling to 75 special education students, seeing 10-15 students, and occasionally their parents, daily. The other counselor is responsible for the guidance and support of over 600 students in grades 7, 8 and 9.

The paperwork-intensive processes of intake, placement, and high school application and articulation consume nearly all of the general education counselor's working day. Especially in a system where mobility is very high, intakes and placement take all of the counselor's time through much of September. High school selection, application and articulation also consume a great deal of the counselor's working time; two-thirds of the effort, she estimates, is related to collecting, filing, correcting and following up on high school paper work. Because of the burdens of paperwork, "I can't really do any counseling," she admits with regret. Most students do receive academic guidance relating to courses and

high school articulation, but few general education students ever receive in-depth counseling, regular appointments or personal support and follow-up.

About seven students are referred for in-depth counseling to a post-doctoral student whose field placement once a week is in school C. As the general guidance counselor refers and works closely with the post-doctoral student, their services are well coordinated, but because field placements change frequently and the placement is not structured into schoolwide planning, even the small amount of in-depth counseling available in school C is not integrated into the school as a whole.

A social worker is also available to provide special education prevention counseling to a small number of students for whom referral to special education might be avoidable. This counseling has no real effect on the level of comprehensive service available in school C, however. The clinician providing ERSS services exhibited extreme paranoia and a strong disinclination to divulge to our research team even the number of students receiving ERSS services in her school. Questions about referrals within school or to outside agencies elicited elaborate commentary that centered on allegations of organized crime activities throughout the catchment area of School C. Conversations with other school staff suggest that this staff member is generally regarded as unbalanced, but other building staff are resigned to the presence of a non-contributing personnel member in their midst.

School D

School D in the Bronx benefits from an administration and staff who stretch themselves to try to meet youngsters' far-reaching guidance and support needs. With 770 students, the school boasts two full-time general education guidance counselors: one counselor works with 300 eighth graders; another sees more than 400 six and seventh graders, and all students who need guidance and counseling in Spanish. The paperwork, they find, is overwhelming: "It consumes us. It absolutely consumes us." To keep records current, meet all deadlines and still be available to students, counselors complete student records at home. With the support of faculty and administration, the eighth grade guidance counselor prepares lesson plans addressing concerns about high school articulation that all graduating students share. About once weekly, especially when a teacher is absent, the counselor visits each class and teaches a guidance lesson to 30 students at a time.

A special education guidance counselor visits school D three times weekly to work with students mandated for counseling, and these services are further supported by a full-time trained crisis intervention teacher who serves as an ombudsperson for all special education students.

The past and present principals are both very "guidance oriented," staff report, and both staffing levels and schoolwide coordination are higher than in many other city schools. The entire school is open until 5:00 PM, and counseling through two different programs targeting "at-risk" students is provided after school, often by the same personnel whom students already know from their regular school day. The school houses an AI/DP program, and 132 targeted at-risk students are counseled by a SAPIS worker through that program. The school also benefits from an innovative program, federally funded and deployed through collaboration between the school and local universities, that recognizes all Puerto Rican students as at risk and provides academic support, counseling and activities to develop cultural awareness, self-esteem and leadership among the school's 120 Puerto Rican students. The AI/DP program is especially well integrated into the school's general functioning; staff report it has "turned around the dropout problem" and started to open the door for improving guidance.

With two generations of administrators who recognize and emphasize guidance and support services, school D enjoys a number of special programs sponsored by civic groups, police and several universities. The presence of so many discrete programs and personnel providing guidance and support services brings confusion as well as benefit however. Staff assert that they have enough programs -- it is necessary now to clarify the roles that each staff member should play in the school. School personnel are concerned about over-servicing certain students and families: services are not coordinated or well integrated into the school, youngsters are pulled out of too many classes and parents are confused about the number of service providers working with their children.

School E

School E in Brooklyn houses two guidance counselors serving well over 800 students. A recently opened school serving large numbers of students living in group homes, foster care facilities, temporary housing and housing projects, guidance and support staffing levels are wholly inadequate to meet the needs of the school population, which has nearly doubled in just this year.

One social worker provides legally mandated services to over 75 special education students weekly: "if I can catch them and they're not chronically absent." This counselor has only been in the school since April 1988, and did not know whether other support services -- attendance coordinators, substance abuse counselors, special education prevention counselors -- were ever present in the school. Prior to April, even the mandated services to special education students were unavailable, and there are no processes for referral or case management. Brand new both in this school and in counseling special education students, she has received no staff development or professional support, and there is no integration of her work with other services in the school: "There is a personnel committee that has been mentioned... but I don't know what they do."

MSG-3/3

A substance abuse counselor is present in the school daily, but his services are not integrated or coordinated with any other school-based support functions. An employee of a district program, the drug counselor punches a time clock in school E, but the principal was unable even to guess who the counselor's supervisor was.

One general guidance counselor has been present since school E's opening three years ago, and she has overall responsibility for the school's 867 students. Although she tries to juggle a caseload comprised of groups of referred sixth and seventh graders with the needs of over 200 graduating eighth graders, she finds this shared caseload denies younger students access to any services for much of the year. To help 200 eighth grade students and their parents understand their available choices and the multi-page application form takes several weeks at a time; the counselor observes that, "for three weeks kids come and are told not today, not today." After several three-week cycles of intense high school application work, younger students are finally discouraged, and a caseload of sixth, seventh and eighth graders is reduced to a caseload of eighth graders only.

Although this counselor demonstrates a wealth of useful guidance experience and a profound concern and understanding of developmental and multicultural issues as they are meaningful for School E's population, only a minority of students directly benefit from her services. A strong proponent of paraprofessional support for guidance functions, she suggests that if paraprofessionals were teamed with interested guidance counselors, then para's could fulfill many of the clerical necessities of high school articulation as well as sit in on small group and individual guidance sessions. As a result, the direct impact of effective guidance and support personnel would be multiplied: para's would become familiar and experienced in the responsibilities of guidance professionals, and trained para's would be available to lead ongoing guidance sessions whenever the immediate presence of the counselor was required by individual students or parents.

School F

In school F, only two guidance counselors are available to work with nearly 1,400 students. Both counselors' official caseloads number near 675 each, but both acknowledge that it is impossible to guide several hundred graduating students through the high school admissions process and work with other students as well; so the actual caseload reflects a distribution dictated by grade level. One counselor attempts to guide 450 graduating ninth graders through application, admission, and successful articulation with their high schools. He also sees five special education students each week to deliver legally mandated services.

The second counselor in school F sees 29 students legally mandated for counseling. In addition to well over a third of a legal caseload of special education students, she is also responsible to meet the guidance and support needs of nearly 900 general education students. The size and scope of this responsibility renders the concept of caseload utterly meaningless. Sharing one beleaguered counselor with over 900 students, many of whom must receive legally mandated services each week, few general education students have any access at all to guidance and support services. The counselor is aware of many family problems, pregnancies, depressions and other conflicts that seventh and eighth graders face in her school, but the enormity of her caseload means that she is unable to work with more than a small fraction of students needing services. The majority of students are deprived not only of direct guidance and support services, but are denied even the sense that counseling and guidance might be a supportive option available to them at some time.

A School Based Support Team (SBST) is present in school F three days each week. In addition to their mandated responsibilities to conduct evaluations, the SBST psychologist and social worker try to eke out some time to deal with the crises that the two overburdened guidance counselors lack time even to hear about. But the services of two professionals who are present only irregularly in the school, have no private office space, are not integrated into the general functioning of the school, and already have a primary responsibility to perform numerous special education evaluations, are glaringly inadequate to address the needs of 1,400 adolescents who have no one else to talk to in school when they are in trouble.

School G

School G suffers not just from scarcity but from a severe fragmentation of guidance and support services. One guidance counselor is responsible for all seventh, eighth and ninth graders in general education as well as 12 special education students mandated for counseling. He has a caseload of well over 700 students in all grades. School administrators feel that ninth graders are better off in junior high school than a high school, and the composition of this counselor's caseload reflects a lack of emphasis on the high school admissions process. Although he tries to guide students in their articulation both from elementary to middle school and from middle to high school, with a full caseload of students in all grades, the counselor is admittedly unable to provide the in-depth sharing of information and teasing out of student interests and goals that the high school application process requires.

On two days each week, the school is visited by another counselor who is bilingual and can, at times provide some in-depth counseling to students referred to her. She is responsible for the counseling needs of five mandated special education students, and because she is not involved in high school admissions or general academic

counseling and recordkeeping for several hundreds of students, she is sometimes able to speak with general education students in a more than fleeting way, as counselors with other responsibilities are frustratingly unable to do. But because she is only in the school for two days weekly, she has no private office, no telephone, nor any other supports necessary to achieve confidentiality, parent contact, or outside referrals. Furthermore, as she is only occasionally present in School G, students whom she works with regularly often do not have access to her services when they are in need.

Three deans are also present in school G, but each has only one-third of a dean's responsibility. Each is responsible for immediate discipline for one grade and maintains two-thirds of a full teaching schedule as well. Coordination between the three deans is crucial, as multiple teaching responsibilities mean that each dean is only sporadically available to students in the grade for which he is responsible. But communication between various support service providers is nearly impossible, they find: "We don't cross paths with the guidance counselor too much," they admit.

School H

In school H, in Queens, three guidance counselors serve over 1,500 sixth, seventh and eighth graders. One counselor is responsible for all academic and personal counseling needs of 600 eighth graders. To guide 600 adolescents through the complex and paper intensive high school application process is a frankly impossible task, and in addition to this overwhelming responsibility, both she and another general counselor are responsible to see 10 special education mandated students each.

A second counselor works with 75 special education students who are legally mandated for counseling. He is also charged with guiding 50 handicapped and emotionally disturbed eighth graders through the high school admissions process. With a caseload of 75 students he is required to see weekly, he works with mandated special education students in groups of two to four, but can offer graduating special education students only a few minutes of contact in the year to select and to apply to appropriate high schools.

The third counselor in school H has responsibility for all other students in the school. A ratio of one counselor to over 900 sixth and seventh graders renders the concept of caseload utterly meaningless. The paperwork alone, she finds, could take all day; five page referrals to special education, lengthy referrals and follow up on reports to Special Services for Children, student Suspense Reports and other crucial documentation consume large amounts of counseling time. With responsibility for over 900 students, all of her direct service time goes to "prioritizing crises." Even a crisis-only system fails when student ratios soar this high and the number of crises far outstrips the number of hours in a day.

This school also houses an AI/DP program, but there is no integration between services delivered through AI/DP and general pupil support services. School guidance counselors report that they were told last year not to work with youngsters receiving counseling through the AI/DP program, as this would represent a duplication of effort. In effect, however, such an arrangement means that AI/DP services supplant, rather than supplement, tax levy services that should be available to all students. For the current year, the counselors were directed to work with all students and instructions not to serve at-risk students targeted by AI/DP services were withdrawn.

Other problems with coordination between school-wide and AI/DP services abound. The principal himself feels that when services are available in response to attendance problems, poor behavior is rewarded and students feel jealous. He also evidences a great deal of confusion about program definitions and eligiblity criteria, reporting, for example, that a child already receiving remedial instruction through state or federal programs cannot be targeted for the state-funded Attendance Improvement/Dropout Prevention Program. Furthermore, in a school where the great majority of families live well below the poverty line, many students read significantly below grade level, and hundreds of students evidence dangerous levels of absenteeism, the selection of a small number of younsters for intensive services according to fixed and exclusive criteria seems arbitrary and even counterproductive to the principal and other building staff.

Most importantly, our interviews showed no overarching understanding of the mission or structure of the Attendance Improvement/Dropout Prevention initiative in school H. The principal reported confusion: "Today you're to get services; tomorrow, someone else is." The general guidance counselor complained: "They get thousands of dollars, but they don't even see any students." And the AI/DP facilitator and guidance counselor noted that other than placement in special remedial classes and promulgating lists of students in the program, no coordination between the school and the AI/DP program is even attempted.

Summary of Case Studies: Lack of Access to Services

Every middle school struggles in its own way to stretch available staff to try to meet students' guidance and support needs. Diminished by the pressures of paper-intensive academic processes and the overwhelming scope of most counselor's caseloads, the support services actually provided to students in city middle schools are often reduced to little more than the mandated tracking of papers and

grades. The complexity of each school's intricate arrangement of general and special education service providers, halves, quarters and thirds of counselors, and staff provided through a range of different programs, boils down to one simple issue: most middle school students have no access to real guidance and support services.

As young adolescents, middle school students need stability and consistency and a sense that they are valued in their environments and their needs are respected and will be addressed. They need real stimulation and challenge, recognition of their strengths as well as their turmoil, and information about healthy modesl for living their present and future lives. But when only one staff member is available to provide academic and personal counseling and meet with several hundreds of young people, students do not have access to services. When paperwork responsibilities command more of the counselor's time than students do, then students do not have access to services. When all counseling staff in a school have large caseloads of special education students whom they are legally mandated to work with, yet no counselor is available on a full-time basis to provide general guidance and support, then students have no access to a base of general (non-categorical) services. When no counselor in a school speaks the only language in which students and parents are able to communicate, then large numbers of students are denied access to services. And when programs and counseling are available within a school but uncoordinated with the general functioning of that school, then most youngsters have no access even to those services.

Administrators and counseling staff stress that all youngsters in city middle schools need access to guidance and support services. Not only are educational options more complex in New York City than in many other areas, but health, sexuality, and drug use all present significant questions to most adolescents, erupting with ferocity in the personal and family lives of large numbers of students in New York's public schools. The litany of social ills affecting the quality of life in New York City has serious ramifications for nearly every adolescent, and all -- not just some -- students at the educational and personal crossroads of urban adolescence need access to personal and academic guidance services in their daily environment.

A recent study by the New York State Department of Education found that social, educational and economic need in New York City creates levels of distress higher here than anywhere else in the state. And anyone who has had contact with an adolescent recognizes that shifting social needs and emotional and physical distress are painfully high at the middle school level. Yet only a very few students in city middle schools have any real access to guidance and support in their schools.

III. GENERAL ACCESS TO SERVICES

The pressing requirements of New York City's high school admissions process command the vast majority of time and other resources available for school-based guidance and support. The inexorable demands of other paper-intensive processes -- the filing and posting of student grades, for example, and the development of a guidance plan to be filed at the district office -- leave very little time available for direct academic or personal counseling. When emergencies arise -- as they inevitably will, given a vibrant population of young urban teenagers -- students and their parents find counselors who are often too busy to see them. As one counselor reported, "It's a question of triage. We have crises lined up outside our door!" Overwhelming ratios of several hundred students to one counselor mean that even students in manifest crisis cannot always see a counselor.

Scarcity and the structure of services drives a crisis-oriented system in which paperwork comes first, crises come second, and prevention, in a system that is barely able even to keep track of crises, comes last. Only students who actively demonstrate signs of crisis receive guidance and support services, and adequate academic and personal counseling, and the ongoing support that makes counseling intervention effective, are rendered impossible by personnel shortages and lack of coordination between in-school and out of school programs.

Ideally, a base of guidance and support services should be available to all students, and supplemental services should target

special groups of students who may benefit from extra counseling, support groups, specific information and other enhanced guidance and support activities. Special populations of youngsters -- special education students, language minority students, economically disadvantaged students, teens at risk of pregnancy or dropping out -- need special supports and enhanced guidance and counseling must be offered to help these youngsters to stay in school and learn effectively.

In many city schools, however, services are only available through special programs like categorical dropout prevention initiatives or special education programming. In the face of severe deficiencies in general services, special programs and services in many cases drive the system. Ironically, instead of directing supplements to students who could benefit from enhanced guidance and support, services are often available only to students who need extra guidance and support. And instead of providing a truly preventive orientation in support services, the availability of services only in special programs means that students have, in effect, to meet negative criteria -- they must be determined to be at risk of substance abuse or dropping out; they must be enrolled in special education and legally mandated for service or at risk of referral to special education -- if they are to receive the guidance and support that should be available to all students.

In the absence of a comprehensive base of general services, reliance on services in special programs drives and reflects a fragmented approach to students needs. Young adolescents are whole beings -- they are not small bits at risk of dropping out and

fragments at risk of special education referral and other pieces in danger of drug and alcohol abuse. But as services are not available to address the whole child, the system depends on special programs that are funded and designed to address certain specific needs.

The force of issue-specific programming means that youngsters are increasingly viewed in terms of the "problems" that make them eligible for services, and problems are treated as isolated issues that are programmatically unrelated. A coherent vision of youngsters as healthy whole entities who deserve and can benefit from support and guidance is lost. By responding only to crises and ignoring the normal development of adolescents, the system is skewed away from healthy and effective prevention of youngsters' academic or personal emergencies. The cost of attention to crises only -- in tax dollars, professional and student morale, and the stability of the daily school environment -- is incalculably high.

Furthermore, reliance on special programs and supplemental services, in the absence of a base of services available to all students, creates competition and resentment between various programs and services providers. Caseloads in general education soar to seven, eight or even nine hundred students per counselor, but caseloads for other special programs are limited to, in most cases, 50-150 students. On the other hand, general guidance counselors usually have private offices, telephones and other important material supports, but counselors in special programs often work without copying machines, telephones, or even their own office space. Further, job requirements, credentials, titles and salary rates

differ significantly for counselors in various programs, and staff are often unaware of the level of training and experience of their colleagues. All too often these distinctions are translated into severe mistrust between various providers of school-based guidance and support.

To illustrate students' lack of access to general guidance and support services and the problems engendered by scarcity and fragmentation of key support services, the following sections describe specific services offered in middle schools throughout New York City and required by federal, state and local legislation and regulation.

1. High School Admissions

High school admissions is a lengthy and complex procedure in New York City. Over 150 different programs and schools are available to graduating middle school students, and competition for special programs is intense. Admissions criteria vary widely from one program to another, but information about screening procedures and criteria is not readily available in the schools. Time constraints between the beginning of school in September and the admissions deadline on January 1st further restrict middle school students' abilities to gain full advantage from the range and number of options available to them. Especially in families where parents are unable to assist students in their choice of New York high schools, counseling is necessary to inform students of their high school choices, to help students develop a sense of the relationship between their interests and talents and possible career and schooling choices, and to help students and parents complete the paperwork necessary to the application process.

For a majority of counselors, graduating students comprise only part of their caseload. When counselors are responsible for all sixth, seventh and eighth graders, or all seventh, eighth and ninth graders, the personal and academic needs of other students are sacrificed so that the academic needs of graduating students can be met. One counselor recognized that younger students, after being turned away from her door repeatedly while she guided eighth graders through high school admissions all fall, rarely returned for counseling in the spring. Younger students learned early on in

their middle school years that a listening ear was simply not available to them.

• Available Services

In recognition of the importance of high school articulation to the middle school guidance function, when a school houses more than one general guidance counselor, one counselor is usually assigned responsibility solely for the graduating class. As detailed in the case studies, however, such an assignment still leaves far too little time for high school guidance and articulation. Even if a counselor is only responsible for the graduating eighth grade, s/he will often have a caseload of 400-600 graduating students, and will still have only 20 minutes of counseling time available per student between the beginning of the school year and the high school admissions deadline.

In the few minutes available per student between September and January 1st, a counselor must meet with parents to discuss high school selection and application, meet with students to discuss interests, talents, choices and the application process itself, and help students fill out their high school application forms. Of course, whenever a student enters a given school for the first time in September and requires intake, orientation and placement, or when any youngster faces a personal or academic dilemma between September and January, or whenever a parent calls or visits the counselor with questions about a student's progress, far less time will be available to guide students through high school admissions that fall.

The greatest danger in the lack of time and personnel to guide students in their transition to high school is that the expectations of the job shrink to fit the time available. When counselors are not familiar with the whole range of programs available to their students, they often take the path of least resistance, steering students into the few high schools they do know well. When counselors' lack of information about program guidelines and application processes lead, unnecessarily, to students' rejection from a number of high school programs, youngsters lose an opportunity to attend a school for which they might be better suited. When counselors do not have time available for meaningful contact with students, they too often rely on dangerous judgments based on sex, race, culture, and class to determine what school or program might be appropriate for a given teenager. When students' fears and uncertainties about high school size and structure go unaddressed, their fears sometimes prevent their ever attending high school; an intimidated or phobic student may drop out between middle and high school without ever being noticed. Counselors' lack of knowledge and familiarity with students sometimes means that staff do not know when a student is under-achieving, and counselors are then unable to push students to their limits. The lack of time, personnel, and staff development regarding school admissions takes a complex system that should open up opportunities for every child, and reduces it to a paperwork chase. In this reductive process, too many students' academic futures are lost.

• High School Paperwork

To be most effective, high school admissions work requires that counselors inform themselves about a full range of available high schools and programs, take responsibility for teasing out students' interests and desires, support students through the process of developing choices at their own pace, and submit paperwork according to deadline. Inevitably, of course, all other responsibilities suffer so that deadlines will be met. Paperwork is tangible and deadlines never wait: with so many responsibilities and so little time to accomplish them all, counseling is sacrificed to meet the inexorable demands of paperwork.

Although responsibility for paperwork often consumes a majority of the time counselors have available for high school applications, no clerical support is currently available for guidance services. In one school visited for this study, a guidance counselor with a Ph.D. in counseling, whose sole responsibility was the eighth grade class, was engaged for the entire day in tearing apart three-page high school acceptance forms and distributing them to students. In some schools, all student records are kept centrally in the guidance office as parents usually contact the guidance counselor first to review a student's record, records are considered more secure in office files than in most classrooms, and guidance personnel are responsible for recording and forwarding students' grades to high schools. Yet even in these schools, clerical support is not provided to guidance offices, and recordkeeping activities further reduce the time that counselors have available to meet with students.

Much of the paperwork relating to high school articulation is tedious, consisting of checking and rechecking computer-entered data for errors, and general recordkeeping is also repetitive and time consuming. Yet licensed guidance counselors have no secretarial services available to support their work. As a result, everyone loses: counselors are tied up with paperwork and unable to use their professional skills and training to support their students, and students and their parents, greatly in need of counseling support, cannot get access to counselors who are buried in paperwork.

• High School Transition and Dropouts

Guiding students from middle school to high school demands great quantities of time and initiative. Anticipating the transition from middle school to high school, students' affective needs are high, as the size of many high schools dwarfs the majority of middle schools, class organization in high school becomes completely departmentalized, students see themselves transformed from upper class students who know their way around to the "new kids on the block," and many students travel increased distances to high schools, attending schools with youngsters who are not yet familiar to them. Students' objective needs are also high, as they need to be shown what their new options are and helped to understand how they can fit themselves into the range of opportunities that should be available to them. Coming at a point in young people's development when their emotions and their bodies are changing rapidly and their social and familial roles are shifting precipitously, the transition

from middle to high school is a frequent point of dropping out. The articulation between middle school and high schools, when ineffectively achieved, constitutes the weakest link in a chain with a disastrously high dropout rate.

Our interviews with school personnel revealed judgments based on stereotypic assessments and expectations of students based on race, sex, and cultural background. These assessments have immediate and discriminatory impact on students' high school selection, and critical consequences that reach far beyond the high school admissions process.

The most critical result of scarcity and lack of access to services is discrimination. Detailed state audits of discriminatory practices have led to the Board of Education's submission to Voluntary Compliance Plans in two different areas related to access to career and occupational programs: one VCP is related to sex equity and another to services for limited English proficient students. Lack of access to guidance and support services in particular is discriminatory in that it creates a crisis-only delivery system that excludes students who, because of gender, culture, or other factors, do not "act out" in an identifiable or predictable way. Lack of success denies meaningful contact to a majority of students, and when meaningful contact is absent, counselors' judgments will too often rest on assumptions based on students' sex, race, culture or class, and personal and academic counseling at critical junctures will be facile or destructive.

2. Special Education

Counseling, guidance and support are understood as necessary educational components for many special education students. The Board of Education's failure to deliver appropriate services has brought special education increasingly under the jurisdiction of the courts, and the counseling of some special education students has been legally mandated. Forty-one percent of special education students are currently receiving legally mandated counseling services in their schools. Maximum staff to student counseling ratios for special education have been set at 75:1 (although attempts are being made to lower the legal limit to 60:1), and the evaluation of students as "mandated for counseling" should drive the hiring of guidance staff at the ratio of one guidance provider for every 75 mandated students.

It is not within the purview of this report to comment on the appropriate delivery of guidance and support services to special education youngsters. It is key, however, to juxtapose guidance and support services for special education students with those provided to general education students. This comparison illuminates the crisis in general education counseling by dramatizing the inefficacy of the general counseling delivery system and by demonstrating how the inadequacy of general guidance systems steers many students into special education programs simply so they might receive counseling that is unavailable in general education.

• Staffing Levels

School Based Support Teams were originally conceived as comprehensive teams of professionals who could evaluate special education

students, provide direct counseling and support services, and offer staff development to all school faculty. This comprehensive model has been reduced, however, to one pressing task, and staffing has been limited to the bare minimum necessary to meet legal mandates for evaluations. Since long waiting lists for evaluation persist, there is no time for SBST members to provide other services. SBST's, comprised of a psychologist, a social worker and an educational evaluator, now evaluate students upon their referral to special education, every three years as required by law, and when requested by the school or parent.

In over forty percent of cases, SBST's determine that special education students are in need of counseling. Staff to student ratios of 1:75 allow special education guidance counselors and social workers to work with 10-15 students daily, spending an average of one-half hour with each student. Counselors often find a half hour inadequate to meet with concerned parents or achieve the in-depth counseling that is sometimes needed, but both the caseload cap and students' right to services have been recognized and mandated by law.

In contrast, student to staff ratios in general education currently average over seven hundred to one. If a special education counselor can provide only minimal levels of counseling to 75 students, then what kinds of service can general education students, with ratios of over 700 to one, possibly be receiving in our schools? As one general guidance counselor with a caseload of 710 students said, "If anyone tells you they're <u>counseling</u> -- they're lying."

MSG-2/2

In response to calls to integrate general and special education services, schools are increasingly reorganizing guidance personnel so that all counselors work with both general and special education students. While this is a laudable method for mainstreaming services to special education students, it cannot be adequately achieved with resources currently available. In many schools, every counselor now has a legally mandated caseload. Counselors are required to work with 10, 20, or over 50 special education students -- and the hundreds of general education students in the same caseload, whose counseling needs have not been legally determined, per force fall to the bottom of every counselor's list.

• Inappropriate Referrals

Given a delivery system in which some special education students receive guidance and support services and general education students as a rule do not, students are too often referred inappropriately to special education simply so they might receive necessary counseling services. Special education psychologists, social workers, educational evaluators and guidance counselors in several schools have all mentioned that many middle school students are referred to special education simply because there are no other alternatives.

Many evaluators feel that referrals to special education initiated when students are already in their early teens are often inappropriate; they consider that only a minority of students manifest emotional disturbances or other handicapping conditions for the first time when they are already adolescents. Except when a student is new to the school system, initial referrals at the middle school level often respond, they feel, to other agendas:

desire to move a disruptive student out of a class, knowledge that a child will feel safer in smaller classes, or concern that a student receive counseling and support unavailable through general education. Students are being mistakenly referred for a phenomenally expensive, highly stigmatizing, and often inappropriate educational program simply because the support provided by small classes and counseling is not available through any other avenue. In one school visited for this study, 40 percent of initial referrals to special education were students who live in hotels and shelters for homeless families. Fully half of the school's total population of students in temporary housing have been referred for special education.

Students who live in temporary housing -- and all other students whose home environments are impoverished and unstable -- need extra support in their school environments. But referral to an expensive and stigmatizing program, from which they may never be decertified, is not the answer.

It is important to note that guidance and support services, even in special education, are far from perfect. Students whose handicapping conditions, exhibited to a marked degree and over a period of time, adversely affect their educational performance, both need and are legally entitled to special education programs. Guidance and support are often found to be crucial components of these programs. But the time allowed for guidance and support in special education is often inadequate, and special education youngsters who receive personal counseling are often not offered the academic counseling necessary to help them realize their educational options. Furthermore, many special education counselors do

not have access to the office space, telephones and other material supports they need, and, all too often, special education counselors are not welcomed or integrated into the central functioning of their schools. Especially when special education counselors are itinerant and visit more than one school each week (as do about half of all special education counselors systemwide), these problems are exacerbated. Furthermore, owing to the virtual absence of direct guidance and support as a feature of general school life, special education students are further stigmatized when their peers become aware that they are seeing a counseling professional on school time.

All of these weaknesses in the delivery system for guidance and support services in special education are further substantiated by a recent (unpublished) membership survey conducted by the United Federation of Teachers. Yet despite serious flaws in services to special education students, the level of guidance and support service availability in special education is still much higher than in general education. Special education administrators, evaluators, service providers and advocates all find that the absence of guidance and support services for <u>all</u> students in a school, coupled with the legally mandated presence of guidance and support services in special education, causes many students to be referred inappropriately to special education programs simply so they might receive the benefit of guidance and support.

3. <u>Categorical Programs and Itinerant Counseling</u>

As crucial guidance and support services have been rebuilt in city schools since the 1974 fiscal crisis, they have increasingly

been recast in a piecemeal fashion. A large number of funding streams support certain categories of youngsters' guidance and support needs, but do not address the comprehensive needs of whole children. Funding is available, for example, for special education prevention, dropout prevention, and substance abuse prevention and intervention. Each of these aspects of student need, however, is addressed in different programs, by different staff, who respond to different supervisors and must complete reams of different and duplicative paperwork. In the absence of sufficient access for all students to a base of comprehensive services, over-reliance on categorical programming drives a system for guidance and support service delivery that is far less rational and cost effective than it could be.

In most schools, reliance on categorical programs in the absence of a comprehensive base of general services skews the entire system away from prevention and towards a crisis-only system. Instead of a daily guidance program that begins with prevention and is available to all students, young people, if they receive any services at all, receive crisis intervention services only. Although categorical programming is often couched in the terms of prevention, students must in fact meet negative defining criteria and exhibit signs of crisis before they are eligible for services. Services are thus available only to small numbers of students whose behavior first qualifies them as legitimately in crisis, and services are not available to prevent educational crises before they erupt.

In a few schools, staff and administrators find that some students are recognized as eligible for crisis services through

such a panoply of different programs that students can actually be over-served through the multiplicity of uncoordinated programs. When a number of different programs target at-risk students in the same school, but programs are uncoordinated within the school, some students and families are over-served, and effectiveness of service plummets. Students' schoolwork suffers when they are pulled out of several classes each week to see a number of different providers, and parents and students become confused about the different programs and service providers working with a given child. Categorical services bring with them a host of methodologies, staff, and supervisors, and coordination between programs is difficult and time consuming. In some cases, staff in different programs do not even know the location of others' offices; in other cases accountability and processes for supervision in various programs are so unclear that coordination is not even attempted.

In all schools, the absence of comprehensive guidance and support services and the ensuing reliance on categorical programming deprives children of services that should be available to them. Young adolescents are whole beings -- they are not small bits at risk of dropping out and fragments at risk of special education referral and other pieces in danger of drug and alcohol abuse. But a system that targets only certain aspects of students' experience as worthy of service underserves the whole child. It establishes a competitive system in which students are rivals for available services and only a student demonstrating crisis can be served.

A further fragmentation of guidance and support services results from the systemwide presence of itinerant counseling. Different itinerant counselors may visit a school once, twice or several times a week to provide health counseling, vocational counseling, counseling for students in temporary housing, substance abuse and other special purpose counseling, as well as special education or general education guidance and support. But while itinerant counseling hopes to address the scarcity of school-based service providers by delivering services to a larger number of students and schools, it can actually exacerbate the fragmentation, underservice and crisis orientation that plague school-based pupil personnel services.

Itinerant counseling brings with it itinerant supervision; it multiplies geometrically the number of supervisory lines and paperwork responsibilities in a building without yielding a concomitant improvement in student access to services. Coordination of services, already sorely neglected in any scarcity-driven system, is rarely even attempted when different providers visit a school on several different days of the week, address a host of different issues, and then report back to several different agencies and supervisors.

Beyond weakening school-wide coordination and multiplying the burdens of paperwork, an itinerant model does not work well for the actual provision of key support services. Some itinerant programs and providers are excellent, and all schools benefit from their occasional presence. Will students seek or accept guidance about school, family, peers and other serious issues from adults whom

they don't know? How likely is it that a young adolescent will confide in an adult who is only occasionally in the building? Young people need more adults whom they know well, recognize, and can talk to in their school buildings.

Furthermore, when counselors are only occasionally present in a school, they rarely have access to key supports like telephones and private offices, rendering meaningful personal counseling or home contact unlikely. Counselors' itinerancy means that they are often not afforded respect as professionals or "real counselors," and schoolwide integration suffers accordingly. When itinerant counselors must see their caseload of students in one school on just one or two days a week, it is impossible not to pull students out of major classes: "We're destroying their program!" one itinerant counselor exclaimed. And finally, students' needs rarely coincide with administrative schedules, so when a student's need erupts on one of the many days that the itinerant counselor is not present, that student has no access to services at all.

• Special Education Prevention

The lack of guidance and support services in general education, and the absence of other alternatives for students who need extra support in their schools, helps steer needy youngsters towards special education. At the same time, very little support exists to prevent unnecessary referrals to special education. In the past, Program Alternatives to Special Education (PASE) programming, designed to reduce inappropriate referrals to special education, allowed districts to reflect the perceived needs of local students in designing

programming, and many schools emphasized guidance and support services in their PASE activities. As the state has become more restrictive, however, support services have been disallowed as a PSEN/PCEN expense, and PASE programming can no longer include guidance and support activities. State Educational Related Support Services Aid (ERSSA) now supports temporary special education prevention counseling and consultation in elementary and high schools, but the amount of aid allows just a small handful of students to be counseled in each school in the name of special education prevention.

The formula for ERSS funding suggests that $155 be targeted to eight percent of students for special education prevention counseling and consultation. The state, however, provides just over one-third of the targeted total of ERSS funding; in an average middle school, with just over 1,000 students, state ERSSA would allow approximately $4,500 for special education prevention counseling. At the per session rates for providers of ERSS counseling (just over $25 per session for guidance counselors, school psychologists, and social workers in 1987-88), this funding would support an average of 180 ERSS sessions, <u>over the course of an entire year</u>, in each elementary and middle school. The EPP's visits to eight representative middle schools found that most ERSS counselors saw approximately 10 ERSS students each, for 10-week renewable cycles. Although neither the state nor the city Board of Education keeps track of the number of students receiving ERSS services, the scope of the ERSS funding

and the number of students in an ERSS caseload represents only a token acknowledgement of the real need for counseling and support to prevent special education referral.

Not just underfunding but also the organization and delivery of ERSS counseling subverts the effectiveness of special education prevention efforts. Delivery of ERSS counseling varies from district to district according to three different delivery models, but in no case is special education prevention integrated into a coherent program of guidance and support. In some schools, a district's ERSS counselor visits once or twice weekly, sees the caseload of 10-20 students, completes paperwork, and leaves. No attempt is made at case management, and itinerant ERSS counselors do not confer with other counselors or teachers working with the same youngsters. In a majority of cases, ERSS funding is absorbed into other sources of support for guidance and counseling services, and a small caseload of students at risk of special education referral is specified for a general tax levy counselor or an SBST social worker or psychologist already in the school on a permanent or an itinerant basis.

In many cases, the possible benefit of ERSS counseling is severely jeopardized by a lack of training, staff development and supervision of ERSS personnel. Counselors were unable to specify therapeutic techniques or even theories that underscored their special education prevention counseling. The only discernible difference ERSS referral made to a counselor's caseload at the middle school level was that paperwork burdens and reporting responsibilities for ERSS are particularly high, and weekly contact with

the ERSS caseload must be documented. In at least some cases, counseling in the name of special education prevention was rendered meaningless when a poorly functioning counselor was assigned putative responsibility for the small number of ERSS students. In one school, the general guidance counselor threw up her hands in resignation: "We've lost control of the ERSS process" she admitted euphemistically, in acceptance of a clinician who refused to cooperate or communicate any information about the students she worked with in the ERSS program. In another school, the counselor with ERSS responsibilities was unable to explain to the EPP's research team what behaviors or concerns might have led to students' being referred for ERSS services, or whether ERSS counseling services differed in any way from other services he provided.

ERSS funding is supplemental to general tax levy funded services, but the services provided through ERSS are rarely defined or understood as supplemental to other guidance and support services. The role and definition of special education prevention has not even been explored in most schools. As the meaning of prevention is so unclear and the number of providers and students affected by ERSS is so minimal, essential special education prevention efforts are tokenized in the schools.

Whether ERSS providers are itinerants working with small numbers of students in several different schools, school-based staff offering ERSS counseling among other guidance and support services, or SBST members whose secondary responsibilities include ERSS counseling, the services offered through various ERSS models have not been integrated into the school's functioning. Lines of

authority and supervision are unclear: counselors must submit paperwork monthly to special education supervisors, district Committees on Special Education or the central Division of Special Education, but no one appears accountable for the quality of service provided through ERSS. No ERSS counselor in the schools we visited was involved in ongoing case management, and school staff all reflected confusion about who had the authority to assign and supervise ERSS counselors.

• Dropout Prevention

About 14,000 middle school students currently participate in state-funded Attendance Improvement/Dropout Prevention (AI/DP) or city-funded Dropout Prevention Program (DPP) initiatives and see counselors as part of a comprehensive dropout prevention program. These programs and the comprehensive counseling they represent are unavailable to the majority of middle school students. AI/DP and DPP programming should be supplemental to schools' guidance and support efforts, but in a system with student to staff ratios so high that most students only see a counselor to fill in forms related to high school application or placement, AI/DP or DPP counseling may represent a student's only real contact with a guidance professional. As described earlier regarding special education services, the lack of general counseling and support, when juxtaposed with richer services for students already in crisis, means that students have access to services only when their academic lives are in crisis, but no services are available to prevent crises before they erupt.

If a student's rate of absence has reached 17-41 percent, far beyond the point of real emergency, s/he may receive counseling and other intensive support through AI/DP or DPP, but only if s/he is enrolled in one of the city middle schools receiving AI/DP or DPP funding. If, however, absence is a problem but not yet an emergency, or if students with dangerous rates or patterns of absence are enrolled in one of the city's 80 middle schools without AI/DP or DPP funding, they may never speak with a counselor. AI/DP and DPP dropout prevention initiatives have generally been well-planned and well-coordinated, but they can only affect those students who are targeted and enrolled in the programs. Of New York City's 178 middle schools, 98 house AI/DP or DPP programs each of which delivers comprehensive support (including counseling, an extended school day, family outreach, high school articulation and health services) to 100-150 students. Of students targeted, over 80 percent were absent in the previous school year for more than one day out of six, and many had rates of absence higher than 40 percent.

Absentee rates of 17-41 percent in middle schools demonstrate grave danger that students will, or already have effectively, dropped out of their education. Students currently targeted by AI/DP and DPP initiatives are clearly in need of comprehensive services to address the personal, familial, social, economic and educational issues that make school unbearable for over one day out of six. As the Public Education Association has demonstrated, however, in an educational system in which one-third of students never graduate from high school, far more than just 100-150 students

in 98 middle schools are at risk. In most middle schools, with an average enrollment of over 1,000 students, far more than 100 students evidence dangerous patterns of absentee behavior. In all of New York's 178 middle schools, some number of students are at real risk of dropping out. And in a system where dropping out is the rule for hundreds of thousands of students, the schools themselves must be understood to be at risk and in need of change.

The EPP's conversations with professional staff providing guidance and support services inside and outside of dropout prevention programs showed that the comprehensive model and effectiveness of AI/DP and DPP programming rarely extended beyond the limits of the program itself and its targeted population. In some cases, professional bitterness divided school and program staff: school staff with caseloads of several hundred students resented the limited size of program caseloads, and program staff bristled at school-based counselors' refusal to confer with program staff and integrate all services to students. Based on varying histories, experience, ideology and professional training, school staff and program staff saw themselves as uniquely able to meet their students' needs and viewed other staff as unable to help young adolescents at all.

The central Board of Education's failure to work with individual schools before AI/DP and DPP programs were installed laid the groundwork for a lack of understanding and a turf-conscious antagonism between school and program staff. One principal admittedly did not know who or how or even why the community-based organization providing DPP services was present in his school. Confusion was transformed

to resentment as it filtered down to counselors whose immense caseloads of at-risk students were not reduced by the infusion of thousands of dollars to buttress support services to students. At the same time, program staff bristled to find that they were not welcomed, nor their efforts appreciated, in schools that many staff proprietarily perceived as "theirs." In cases like this, dropout prevention initiatives were isolated, and the possible benefit of dropout prevention work to a school's coherent programming was lost.

In some situations, AI/DP and DPP programs are well-integrated into the general functioning of the school, but in such cases integration was a function more of personality than of structure. In one school, for example, the AI/DP coordinator and a dean with significant responsibility for guidance and support services had actually attended high school together, and each returned from college and graduate study to work in the old neighborhood. The dean tried to replicate the successful AI/DP model in general guidance and support programming, and many guidance and support staff in that school feel themselves to be committed to a multi-faceted dropout prevention initiative, and do not cleave to mutually antagonistic definitions of insider vs. outsider and programs vs. school. Administrators and staff feel the model of the AI/DP program "has really turned the dropout problem around," and morale among all guidance and support staff is high.

As the Public Education Association's 1988 report found, whole-school intervention efforts are the most effective. Successful

models like this demonstrate that genuine acceptance, understanding and integration of school-based categorical programs is possible, and when it is achieved, all students and staff benefit. Structures for integrating school-based services and personnel must be integral to the introduction of all categorical programs into schools, however. The existence of schoolwide coordination and a shared sense of mission should not depend, ultimately, on the play of personality.

• Substance Abuse Prevention

Substance Abuse Prevention and Intervention Service (SAPIS) workers, funded through the State's Department of Substance Abuse Services (DSAS), should currently be a part of every middle school's guidance and support programming, and a maximum of 50 students per school may receive individual or group counseling services through SAPIS programs. Several interlocking factors, however, mitigate against the integration of substance abuse counseling into a comprehensive package of school-based guidance and support programming.

Firstly, substance abuse personnel nearly always answer to supervisors removed from the immediate school setting; in several schools we visited even the school principal did not know who supervised the school-based SAPIS worker. Many staff members feel that substance abuse workers lack accountability, and because they answer to supervision at the district rather than the school level, SAPIS workers are rarely included in school-based planning, coordination and referral.

Secondly, although licensing, testing and differentials for education are central to most school personnel matters, school

SAPIS workers are not licensed in any way. If SAPIS workers have a college degree in a related field (e.g., psychology, sociology or biology), they must have a minimum of six months' experience at counseling related to drug or alcohol abuse. With a high school diploma only, candidates must have a minimum of two years' experience to be eligible for hiring. Applicants are hired by district program directors, and no central licensing is necessary to counsel in a district's SAPIS program. Many school personnel, highly sensitive to the question of credentials, interpret SAPIS workers' lack of license as a lack of professionalism, and often cite this deficiency in refusing to collaborate with substance abuse workers.

Last, and perhaps most importantly, the methodology and theoretical underpinnings of substance abuse workers usually differ -- and sometimes conflict -- with the methodology of other school-based guidance and support services. For arguably sound reasons, many SAPIS workers are ex-addicts or relatives who have been strongly affected by an addict's drug use. School-based guidance counselors often point out "the mystique of the ex-junkie," and are loathe to endorse youngsters' association with staff who transmit familiarity with drug culture. At the same time, substance abuse workers, many of whom have experienced first-hand what the consequences of alienation from school and society can be, often empathize with youngsters in their disaffection with school, and may encourage students' perceptions that no one else in the building understands their experience.

Overt conflicts like these arise not simply from differences in experience, background and training of SAPIS and school guidance and support staff, but primarily from the fact that substance abuse prevention and intervention services are conceived as something apart from a school's organic functioning. Counselors and support workers all recognize that drug and alcohol abuse is intimately connected to the difficulties youngsters face with their families and their peers. Problems at home, in school and with peers cannot be separated out from problems with drugs and alcohol, yet services addressing substance abuse are provided through distinct programs, with entirely different lines of supervision, counseling staff and program methodology. As a result of this programmatic distinction, the services of over one hundred dedicated support personnel in needy middle schools are lost to comprehensive schoolwide programming. Distinct program definitions, based on funding streams and central prescriptions, and differences in supervision, methodology and staff have too often solidified into mutual mistrust. The rigidity of the resulting fragmentation denies students the possible benefit of a team of comprehensive services in their schools.

• Bilingual Guidance and Support

In a system where 70,000 elementary and middle school students are designated limited English proficient (LEP), only 56 licensed bilingual counselors are available to speak with students and parents in their own languages. Few counselors employed in city schools can work with LEP students in their own languages. In the instances where bilingual counselors are present, the structure,

size and organization of their caseload means that too few students have access to their services. Two million dollars were allocated through Module 5B in fiscal year 1988 to enhance bilingual guidance services. This funding resulted in the hiring of 70 bilingual guidance providers, not all of whom were licensed counselors. In an undetermined number of cases, these new personnel did not represent an expansion of bilingual services, but were the first and only bilingual guidance personnel in their schools.

In one school the EPP visited, a bilingual social worker was the only Spanish-speaking guidance professional in a school in which over one-quarter of students were designated limited English proficient, and an estimated 90 percent of students spoke Spanish in their homes. Spanish-speaking parents and students, however, had very little access to this professional, as she already maintained a full legal caseload of 75 special education students and a long waiting list of other students legally mandated for services.

In many schools, the only counselor who can communicate with language minority students and their parents is the special education counselor. The EPP applauds the presence of bilingual guidance personnel in our schools, while noting that even in special education, thousands of students still have no access to a counseling professional who can speak their language. But the presence of a language appropriate counselor only for special education may lead to inappropriate referrals to special education, and it certainly means that limited English proficient students in general education, even in a school with a bilingual counselor present, are dramatically underserved. Special education counselors often struggle to meet with the legally

mandated caseload. They have no time or resources available to meet with students beyond that caseload -- even if those students cannot even communicate with anyone else.

In another district, bilingual service providers were considered a high priority at the middle school level, and six bilingual counselors, speaking four different languages as well as English, were distributed throughout the schools in that district. Yet overall scarcity meant that most counselors were only present in a given school for one, two, or three days weekly, and bilingual counselors were placed in as many as four different schools each week. When counselors are only occasionally present in a school, their impact is considerably weakened. Students, faculty and administrators are often confused about when each counselor is in the building, and students must frequently be pulled out of their classes to fit into a counselor's once or twice weekly visit. Itinerant counselors virtually never have private space in which to speak to students, and counselors are rarely treated with full professional respect or integrated into schoolwide functioning when they are only present in a school on an itinerant basis.

Itinerant counseling and other organizational patterns that limit students' access to bilingual professionals are often considered a necessary response to the insufficiency of bilingual counselors and candidates to work in city schools. Yet counselors and other guidance professionals volunteer numerous accounts of obstruction, delay and humiliation they have encountered at the central level in the face of their attempts to become licensed bilingual counselors. (See accounts, page 73.)

Efforts to recruit and train bilingual counselors must be increased, and the abolition and reorganization of the Board of Examiners and the Division of Personnel must be effected immediately to eliminate the obstructive humiliation and delays that candidates encounter through these bureaucracies. Monies must specifically target the hiring of bilingual and bicultural counselors. The entire system -- from the central to the school level -- must make the hiring of bilingual staff a real priority if language minority students' counseling needs are ever to be addressed.

• Other Categories of Need

Even the categorical delivery model currently in place fails to address certain categories of high student need. The promotional gates program, for example, maintains a "gate" at grade 7, and large numbers of seventh graders are retained for remediation in a second year of seventh grade. This seventh grade "gate" creates a body of young adolescents who are simultaneously over-age for their grade and stigmatized by their apparent failure. Yet although being over-age for the grade or academically stigmatized are major indicators of a tendency to drop out of education, no counseling is available through any program to address the affective needs of young people retained at the seventh grade gate. Only if a retained seventh grader is already a participant in a dropout prevention program or in special education will s/he have any real access to counseling.

The need for guidance and support relating to sexual activity and decision making is also especially high in the middle school years. A majority of middle school youngsters are either sexually

active or considering sexual activity in the years between sixth and ninth grade, and students need information and support to help them make critical decisions about initiating sexual involvement, effectively practicing contraception, and protecting themselves from sexually transmitted disease. An estimated 40-50 percent of young women who drop out in their teen years leave school because they are pregnant or parenting. Large numbers of young men also leave school in response to the increased financial burdens and emotional complexities that teenage pregnancies bring. At a time when pregnancy rates among 15-19 year olds are beginning to drop, pregnancy rates among young women under fifteen have increased by almost seven percent. (New York City Department of Health statistics: 1980-1985). Yet no comprehensive counseling or guidance-oriented staff development exists at the middle school level to address the range of issues surrounding sexual activity for young adolescents.

Both well-informed guidance, as well as curricular support, are necessary to help bring crucial understandings of child and adolescent development to bear on youngsters' critical decisions about their sexual lives and futures. The Family Living/Sex Education curriculum is a vital piece of schools' responsibility to help students make healthy and responsible sexual choices. But clinically-recognized components of adolescent development also play a key role in youngsters' decisions, and it is crucial that students benefit from guidance and support concerning their levels of sexual activity, safety, contraception and health. Staff development is key to offering students developmentally sound and well-informed support around these issues. Teachers of Family Living/Sex Education should

benefit from guidance-oriented professional staff development, and should offer group guidance in Family Living/Sex Education, Home and Career Skills, and other classes.

Similarly, school staff and administrators increasingly recognize the widespread incidence of violent, verbal, and sexual abuse of children. Professionals in a school have a legal responsibility to report and follow-up on all suspected cases of child abuse. But no specific program yet exists to provide counseling or support to youngsters who have survived abuse, are trying to avoid violent and sexual abuse, or are in the midst of a legal custody case resulting from child abuse. Instead, general guidance providers who are already impossibly over-burdened with caseloads of several hundred students find that the emotionally stressing, time-consuming and often frustrating work of referring cases to Special Services for Children devolves upon them alone.

The guidance and support needs of homeless youngsters are also exceptionally high, yet little school-based support exists to address their needs. In some cases, a per diem counselor visits a school to participate in after-school programming for homeless youngsters, and some students in temporary housing see Board of Education counseling staff in hotels and shelters. But homeless students are especially mis-served by the inadequacy of general school-based guidance and support services. Many school staff report a dramatic overrepresentation of homeless students in referrals to special education; they feel that homeless youngsters have inappropriately been referred to special education because services are unavailable

in regular education to address their heightened needs. Students in temporary housing, and other students whose home environments are impoverished and unstable, need extra support in their home environments. But inappropriate referral to special education, with the stigma and expense attendant on it, is not an acceptable response to the inadequacy of general guidance and support services.

Conclusion: Access and Delivery of Services

Within the current system for guidance and support service delivery, most middle school students have no access to direct guidance and support services. Emphasis on paper responsibilities and academic guidance leave little time for personal counseling or the in-depth academic or personal counseling that recognizes youngsters as whole beings whose academic and personal needs are inextricably connected. While crises that erupt on school time may receive the momentary attention of school-based guidance and support staff, no services are available to try to prevent crises from disrupting students' educational lives. The lack of preventive service exacts an incalculable price: school morale deteriorates endlessly, students' educational futures and options are unnecessarily truncated, and students, their families, and the entire city of New York suffer the consequences of the lack of guidance for young adolescents.

The Educational Priorities Panel believes that profound review and restructure of guidance and support services is necessary to improve school-based guidance and support. The base of general services must be significantly restructured and enhanced if students are to have meaningful access to necessary academic and personal

supports. Beyond a base of appropriate services, additional enhanced services must target groups of youngsters who have special needs and may benefit from developmentally sound information and services to prevent unnecessary referrals to special education, teenage pregnancy, and dropping out.

It is critical that support services be restructured within a comprehensive model. Identifiable targets for counseling and intervention -- drug abuse, child abuse, alcohol abuse, absentee problems, dropout behavior -- are intimately connected; they are usually facets of the same student need. Programs that focus on one single aspect of need are usually insufficient to address the complexity of students' problems, and they fail to address the central issue of improving student access to a base of high quality school-based services. Students need more professionally trained adults whom they know well in their schools. Opportunities for meaningful contact must be improved, paperwork responsibilities must be streamlined, and student access to services must be enhanced. To be most effective, guidance and support personnel must be consistently present in a school, and services must be well coordinated within each school building. Without an effective base of services and a comprehensive model for case management and service delivery, students, the city, and the state get poor value for their guidance and support service dollars.

RECOMMENDATIONS: STRUCTURES AND DELIVERY OF SERVICES

Recommendations: Central Planning and Coordination

- The central Board of Education should coordinate funding to maximize the benefit of all categorical programs and monies to city schools. Entire buildings, rather than discrete numbers of students within each school building, should be targeted with special supports for at-risk populations. Ultimately, state and city categorical funding should directly target those schools that have large concentrations of at-risk students. This distribution of funds would enable schools to provide more comprehensive support services to all students, and elminate stigma and unnecessary paperwork attendant on distribution that finds only a certain number of at-risk students eligible for special services in each school. Until such changes in aid distribution are effected, the central Board of Education should coordinate funding for special programs by developing a financial tracking system that would not require local schools to track the source of categorical funding. Central planning and administration should remove the burden of paperwork from individual schools by ensuring that -- on a citywide basis -- requisite numbers of students have been targeted for programs whose definitions specify a target population of students.

- The central Board of Education should begin immediately to review a wide range of models for effective guidance and support services. Some examples of models to be reviewed would be:

  ° A new job title could be devised for guidance providers who would report to the building principal but who would, unlike a guidance counselor, work flexible hours, make home visits, and be available to students and parents until 6:00 p.m.

  ° Counseling professionals could be designated staff developers with responsibility to train and teach all staff about guidance-related issues.

  ° Paraprofessionals could be hired and assigned to guidance practitioners. Counselors who wished to provide mentoring to a paraprofessional would receive the day-to-day benefit of the para's presence in group and individual counseling sessions as well as in processing guidance paperwork.

  ° Diverse staff, including teachers, paraprofessionals, and staff from community-based organizations should be hired or contracted to perform guidance functions.

- Every student could be assigned one adult in the building to whom the student can reach out for guidance and support needs. This coordinator should direct students to other members of a team of adults with shared responsibility for the same group of students. Each adult (teacher, guidance person, dean, etc.) should be responsible to mentor a small and discrete number of students.

- Within the model above, students on a grade could meet together with a team of adults that would follow the group through their years in middle school. Alternatively, a team of adults could be responsible for a group of students who would not necessarily share a grade or meet together.

- Group guidance, through a "house plan," "family group," or supervised peer counseling, could be programmed into students' school day.

- The functions and time allotted to homeroom could be expanded to include information and guidance about placement and other academic issues.

- Teachers and other non-guidance personnel could be trained and designated within each middle school to be responsible for high school applications, admissions, and articulation.

- Class size could be reduced, and teachers trained to infuse smaller classes with guidance and support precepts and materials. Smaller classes could thus function as settings for group guidance. Teachers of Family Living/Sex Education or Home and Career Skills classes would be obvious targets for this approach, and it could be extended throughout the school.

The central administration should begin to review these and other new models for service delivery immediately. The most effective means would be to schedule a planning conference in the summer of 1988 specifically to review and restructure guidance and support services. Schools and districts should reflect diversified hiring and the restructure of guidance and support service delivery in new program organization for September 1988, and future programming should continue to build upon successful models for each school.

Recommendations: Comprehensive Services

- Guidance and other pupil personnel staff should form an organizing body for comprehensive guidance and support services in every school. All providers of guidance and support services -- general and special education guidance

counselors and social workers, substance abuse workers, attendance workers, deans, assistant principals with responsibility for a grade, counselors and case managers in AI/DP or DPP programs -- should be members of this body. Roles, responsibilities and structures for referral must be clearly delineated, and case management should be discussed in regularly scheduled meetings of the guidance and support services team.

- A school administrator or members of this organizing body must designate a coordinator for every school's guidance and support service team. The coordinator (principal, dean, assistant principal, counselor, social worker, etc.) of the school's organizing body for guidance and support services should have a clearly stated responsibility to target and address all impediments to integration of staff in a coordinated delivery system.

- District hiring should phase out the itinerant service model for pupil personnel services. New funding should support staff who will be present in the school on a full-time basis and participate fully in a coordinated team for guidance and support services.

Recommendations: Improving Access to Services

- School administrators and staff should allocate positions so that clerical support, provided by secretaries or by guidance paraprofessionals in career ladder positions, is available to complete paperwork and to check computer-entered data, thus freeing up counselors' time for direct student contact.

- The Division of Personnel must emphasize recruitment and hiring of bilingual personnel so that guidance and support services are available in the languages that students and their parents speak. Multilingual personnel must not only be present in the schools, but must actually have room in their caseloads to work with language minority students and their parents.

- Middle school and district staff should make the funding of afterschool and summer time guidance and support services a priority use for new funding. Afterschool and extended day programs should all include a counseling component. Students, parents, educators and advocates argue increasingly for the social and academic importance of extended school days, and counseling and guidance are vital components to the support that extended school days should provide. Schools are currently open all day and until 6:00 p.m. School-based services, as well as community-based organizations, should

gain full advantage of school facilities. Guidance and support services should be available in the schools from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. throughout the year.

- Guidance staff or designated members of the faculty should gather information about community resources for guidance and support services. This staff member should coordinate follow-up on referrals between the school and community-based organizations.

- Guidance and support personnel should regularly go into the classrooms and present materials to an entire class of students at one time. Similarly, a great many guidance and support issues should be integrated directly into middle school classes, notably the Family Living/Sex Education and Home and Career Skills curricula. Most young adolescents share a body of concerns about family life, sexuality, drugs and alcohol, health, careers, and transition to high schools. Addressing these issues in large groups will provide the important counseling precept that students are not alone with their concerns and, at the same time, improve all students' sense of counselors' accessibility. Guidance-oriented staff development should augment the training for all teachers, especially those teaching Family Living/Sex Education and Home and Career Skills classes.

- Staff developers should emphasize that unusually quiet students, as well as disruptive ones, should be considered for referral to in-school or community-based counseling.

- Guidance staff should supervise and coordinate peer counseling for middle school students. As young adolescents are taking more responsibility for their lives and questioning the authority of adults in their environments, peer counseling is increasingly appropriate at the middle school level. Supervised peer counseling classes and peer counseling sessions should be programmed into youngsters' school day as they are in high schools through the SPARK program.

Recommendations: High School Admissions

- School administrators or staff should designate one staff member in each school whose primary mission is to guide students through the high school application and articulation processes. This staff member could be a guidance counselor, dean, or other member of a school's non-instructional staff, but should have expertise in the high school admissions process and be familiar with high school programs before the school year begins. On-the-job training in high school admissions is inappropriate, as time limits between the start of school and the admissions deadline are severe.

- Principals' allocations of positions should include clerical support for the high school application process, as high school admissions and articulation are especially paper-intensive processes. Clerical support of guidance functions should be as consistent as possible to maximize the benefit of familiarity with high school application forms and deadlines.

- The High School Division should offer training to understand the high school application process directly to middle school staff. Turnkey training and workshops for district personnel are inadequate to affect school staff with responsibility for high school admissions and articulation. The Division of High Schools must communicate directly with city middle schools, offering training at least twice yearly to familiarize staff with new high school programs as well as application requirements and procedures, and districts should encourage middle school staff to coordinate with high schools.

- Middle school guidance or other staff should organize and escort students in each middle school to the annual High School Fair.

- Instructors and guidance staff should integrate many components of the high school articulation process into the Home and Career Skills curriculum currently required in middle schools. Classroom exercises should help students discover their individual talents and interests and help elaborate possible connections between interests, career directions, and both vocational and academic high school programs. Lessons should be designed to familiarize students with the organization and structure of high schools and to teach important terms to erase the transition between middle and high school. A five-part curriculum, Planning for High School, has been developed, and this can serve as a foundation; however, curricula must be accompanied by staff development for teachers to be effective.

- Guidance staff should plan family outreach workshops to present the roles that families can play in high school application and articulation. Workshops should familiarize parents with high school terminology, the multi-page high school application form, and the structure and organization of high schools and special programs. Workshops must be well advertised and offered in the evenings when most family members can attend. Such workshops are currently provided in some schools, but only sporadically. They must become a regular and well-advertised part of the middle school calendar.

- Each school's pupil personnel should select and support one staff member to organize big sister and big brother

programs, pairing students from "feeder" middle schools and high schools. Big sibling programs should help middle school students understand their choices and navigate the transition from middle to high school.

Recommendations: Special Education Prevention

- School Based Support Team members should help to infuse special education prevention throughout each school's guidance and support services programming. Theories and techniques to prevent inappropriate referrals to special education must be explored through staff development activities involving all guidance and support staff.

- The State should increase funding for special education prevention so that small amounts of funding do not fragment services and lead to the tokenization of preventive efforts. The task of avoiding preventable referrals to special education should be understood as crucial to a school's well being, and funding should support special education prevention as a central component of each school's guidance and support services programming.

Recommendations: Dropout Prevention

- The central administrative office with responsibility for AI/DP and DPP programming should disseminate models for effective dropout prevention initiatives throughout the system. Not every school can benefit from the density of services provided through costly city- and state-funded categorical dropout prevention programs, and limited resources are appropriately concentrated in those schools with the greatest need. However, all schools should have information enabling them to build toward a comprehensive and coordinated array of counseling, family outreach, high school articulation, health services and extended school day.

- Every school's guidance team should include at least one staff member with the freedom and responsibility to make home visits. The presence of this staff member should be obvious to all students, to his or her contact with students and parents should be fully integrated into the comprehensive referral system for guidance and support.

- Whenever categorical dropout prevention programs are planned, the central administrative offices for dropout prevention initiatives must include school-based staff and administrators in decision-making from the very beginning. The location and integration of categorically funded dropout prevention programs must be a function of collaboration and invitation at the school level.

IV. PERSONNEL ISSUES

Comprehensive improvement of middle school guidance and support services relies directly on the hiring, support, and effective integration of school-based personnel. Enhanced funding in fiscal year 1989 should allow the hiring of significant numbers of new guidance and support personnel, and improved funding should continue to be allocated to support an improved restructured system, until guidance and support services achieve an effective level in all city schools. All personnel decisions must be carefully made and monitored to ensure that all new hiring contributes to comprehensive and effective delivery of services.

• Recruitment

Common wisdom holds that few licensed guidance counselors are available to be hired by the New York City Board of Education. As is usually the case, the common wisdom is only partially right. Very few counselors in general education have been hired since hiring was frozen and counselors were "excessed" in the 1974 fiscal crisis. And in response to a great dearth of positions, the city is witnessing a dearth of qualified applicants for guidance support positions. The simplest laws of supply and demand suggest that as responsible well-paying posts become generally available in city schools, more college and graduate students will train and become licensed to apply for those positions. To a certain extent, the Panel predicts that these expectations will be realized, and increases in availaility of guidance candidates will follow increases in availability of guidance positions.

Current Board of Education practices, however, significantly hinder the recruitment of school personnel. As the Educational Priorities Panel documented in its 1987 report, A Teacher for the Apple: Why New York City Can't Staff its Schools, delay, obstruction and humiliation at the Division of Personnel and the Board of Examiners retard New York City's ability to staff the public schools. These findings are reflected in the system's treatment of guidance and support personnel matters, to wit:

- The Board of Education's Division of Personnel has not defined or quantified the current need for guidance and support staff or assembled data on the number of temporary, permanent or state-licensed guidance providers in the employ of the Board of Education. It is thus unable to recruit staff effectively. The Division of Personnel has no strategy for recruiting guidance personnel among college students, graduate students, recent immigrants or teachers currently in the system.

- The process of upgrading licenses and obtaining salary differentials for education credits and experience is of particular consequence for guidance and support personnel, as all must have graduate credits and many counselors hold multiple licenses. The process requires a trip to the Brooklyn-based Division of Personnel during working hours, a complete set of original college and graduate school transcripts, a $30 medical examination, and a $12 set of fingerprints -- for every new license or differential.

- Although Board of Examiners' tests are duplicative of examinations counselors take in their Masters and Ph.D. programs, as well as the National Teachers Examination (NTE), these tests are currently necessary for any counselor to be appointed in a New York City school. The process of trying to take the Board of Examiners' licensing examination can be frustrating, humiliating and time consuming. Although the Board of Examiners has offered guidance exams annually for the past several years, no examination has even been listed in the public schedule of examinations for the last three years. Applicants must register to take the exam five full months before it is offered. The next guidance licensing exam will be offered in November 1988, and current regulations will allow up to a full year before it is scored and a list for hiring promulgated.

This endlessly repetitive process is designed to simplify recordkeeping in the poorly organized bureaucracy at the Division

of Personnel -- at the price of costly, time-consuming and humiliating experiences for all current and prospective guidance personnel.

Staffing shortages are recognized as especially critical for bilingual guidance and support personnel, but bilingual professionals themselves offer numerous accounts of the obstruction and delay encountered in the face of their desires to work with New York City's schoolchildren. In one multilingual district the EPP visited, district staff tried to prioritize the hiring and placement of bilingual counselors in 1987-88 and encountered the following:

- a school social worker who is a Dominican-born native Spanish speaker failed the oral Spanish language section of the Board of Examiners' test for bilingual guidance counselors.

- A bilingual Korean speaker with a Ph.D. in social work is working as a Temporary Per Diem teacher because she cannot get her doctorate converted into a license to counsel New York City school children.

- A candidate who is fluent in English, Mandarin and Cantonese, and holds a Master's degree in counseling, took the Board of Examiners test and had to wait for nearly a full school year for the test to be marked, as the candidate's linguistic abilities surpassed those of the staff available to mark the exams. During that school year, needy students had no access to her training or counseling skills, as she worked as a school secretary.

These accounts are offered to illustrate the point that, even in the critical area of bilingual guidance providers, qualified and trained professionals who want to counsel in city schools are temporarily or permanently deterred by the central Board of Education's bureaucratic barriers. As long as professionals encounter obstruction, disdain and humiliation in response to their desires to work in city schools, students will be denied the services those professionals could offer.

• Staffing

The position of guidance counselor is a pedagogical one; applicants are hired by the New York City Board of Education, and candidates must pass a New York City Board of Examiners test and fulfill New York State licensing requirements to be appointed as permanent guidance counselors. Counselors working on a temporary basis must have a bachelor's degree, 30 graduate credits and a supervised practicum in the field of guidance and counseling. Within five years, practitioners of guidance must hold a Master's degree (60 graduate credits) and have two years of guidance experience in pupil personnel services. No teaching experience or training is required of guidance personnel, and guidance counselors practice only on school days and during school hours.

The needs of public school students and the availability of trained personnel to address their needs have changed dramatically, however, since guidance and support services were virtually eliminated in our schools in the mid-1970's. Future guidance and support services funding should be used to support not just licensed guidance counselors but also:

- Teachers with training, responsibility and sensitivity to guidance issues,
- Clerical support for guidance offices, freeing up counselors' time for direct service,
- Licensed social workers,
- Community workers, through contracts with community-based mental health or social service organizations,
- Paraprofessionals in career ladder positions.

Diversified hiring is necessary to augment the pool of qualified providers of guidance and to enhance guidance and support services throughout city schools. School-based collaborative decision making should prioritize personnel to be funded with new pupil personnel allocations. When schools conceptualize new systems and restructure guidance and support services, they will reap greater benefit from increased funding.

Priority should be given to hiring multilingual and multicultural personnel, as pupil personnel services now bear no representative relationship to the student body. In a system where 70 percent of students are black and Latino, only 16 percent of guidance personnel are people of color. Students must feel free to discuss the most sensitive personal, social and educational concerns with guidance staff, and while guidance skills and training do not cleave precisely to the categories of race or ethnicity, movement towards representivity of the student body is especially crucial in the area of guidance and support. If recruitment and hiring efforts do not specifically target bilingual and bicultural guidance staff, raging demographic disparities will never be addressed, and the majority of students will, in effect, be invited not to participate in school-based guidance and support. Support for internships, graduate credits and career development for paraprofessionals, teachers, and other staff interested in guidance must be part of a sustained effort to augment the body of trained professionals available to provide guidance to students.

• Staff Development and Coordination

Staff development activities and coordination of pupil personnel services are crucial to protect the system's investment in new personnel and ensure that all new funding results in improved services to students. School-based staff development workshops should train guidance staff to understand and deliver bias-free guidance to all students. Multicultural issues and intergroup relations should be stressed in all staff development activities, and guidance personnel should be trained as school leaders in human relations.

Every school should have a coordinated system for the provision of guidance and support services. Roles and responsibilities for all providers of guidance should be explored and delineated, and case management should be discussed at regular meetings. Systems for referral and case management must be in place, and plans for coordination and integration of guidance services within each school should be clearly outlined. One staff member in each school's pupil personnel group should be responsible for coordinating meetings and ensuring that all pupil personnel services are integrated within the school.

RECOMMENDATIONS: PERSONNEL

- To make effective recruitment possible and enable schools to improve services to students, the State legislature must abolish the Board of Examiners. The Division of Personnel must dramatically reorganize its activities to highlight recruitment and outreach, streamline recordkeeping, and extend a meaningful welcome to all personnel considering employment in city schools.

- The districts must use guidance and support service allocations to hire staff who can be present in the school on a full-time basis and participate in the coordination efforts of strong school-based guidance and support service delivery teams.

- Districts should hire personnel with a range of different educational and professional backgrounds. Guidance and support personnel could include social workers, deans or other administrators with increased guidance and support responsibilities, teachers working towards certification as guidance professionals, community-based service providers, paraprofessionals in career ladder positions, and clerical support for guidance functions.

- The Division of Personnel, in collaboration with school and district staff, should devise a new title and position for a guidance provider who would report to the school principal, participate in schoolwide guidance and support services team meetings, and provide services to students and parents in the late afternoon, evenings, and when school is not in session. Guidance providers hired under a new title and in new positions should be full time workers with flexible hours beyond the 8:30 - 3:00 school day; they should, of course, be fairly compensated for their year-old full time work.

- Districts and the Division of Personnel should make every effort to hire bilingual and bicultural guidance professionals and paraprofessionals. School administrators and guidance and support staff should ensure that paraprofessionals hired in guidance and support services are participants in career ladder programs offering support for education and advancement to professional positions.

- District and school leaders should work with the Division of Personnel to review hiring and licensing requirements for guidance personnel. Participants with responsibility for review should, where appropriate, change these requirements so that professionals who are trained and qualified to provide social and psychological -- as well as academic -- counsel are not unnecessarily deterred from service in city schools.

- The Board of Education's proposed Guidance Assistant Program should be established and funded. The Guidance Assistant Program would, by reducing participants' teaching loads, assigning each teacher a guidance mentor, and sponsoring graduate coursework, help teachers become certified as guidance counselors.

- Local, district and central staff development should involve training and sensitivity about personal and academic issues that affect young adolescents. Staff development activities throughout the school should stress multicultural sensitivity and intergroup relations. School administrators should encourage all staff to participate in guidance-oriented staff development activities.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: MIDDLE SCHOOL GUIDANCE AND SUPPORT SERVICES

Anastas, Jeane W., et. al. — "Guidance Services for Children and a Right to Education Law: Results of a Longitudinal Study," in Personnel and Guidance Journal, vol. 61, no. 10, pp. 615-619, June, 1983.

Baker, Stanley B. — Accountability for School Counseling Programs Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Personnel and Guidance Association, April 15, 1981.

Bergmann, Sherrel and Jeanne Baxter — "Building a Guidance Program and Advisory Concept for Early Adolescents," in NASSP Bulletin, vol. 67, no. 463, pp. 49-55, May 1983.

Cole, Claire G. — A Model for a Middle School Guidance Program Based on Developmental Tasks of Students, National Middle School Association, Fairborn, OH, 1981. Paper included in "Middle School Research: Selected Studies 1977-1979. Volume II."

Community Service Society — Selected New York City Public School Data 1986-1987, 1988.

Defino, Maria; Jenkins, Vivian — A Look at State Compensatory Education in AISD, 1984-85. Austin Independent School District, Texas Office of Research and Evaluation, 1985.

Finch, Marion B.; Dunn, Richard B. — "Teachers Advising Students: A Successful Program," in Spectrum, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 3-6, Winter, 1984.

Griffith, Bernadette — "Meeting Needs--Ideas that Work, Educational Reform, Career Education and the Middle School," in Guidance & Counselling, vol. I, no. 5, pp. 62-67, May 1986.

Gunderson, Margaret S.; Moore, Earl J. — Guidance Program Assessment Procedures for Elementary and Secondary Schools, Georgia Comprehensive Guidance Series, Missouri University, Columbia, Department of Counseling and Personnel Services, 1981.

Malinka, Robert M., Ed. — Middle School Research: Selected Studies 1977-79, Volume II. National Middle School Association, Fairborn, OH, 1981.

New York State Education Department — Report on Pupils-at-Risk, Office of Elementary, Secondary, and Continuing Education, Albany, September 1984.

Ideas that Work: A Compendium of Guidance Program Practices K-12, Bureau of Pupil Services, Albany, 1984.

Oregon State Department of Education — Middle School Guidance and Counseling: Suggested Guidelines for School Districts, Salem, 1984.

Oxley, Diana — Effective Dropout Prevention: The Case for Schoolwide Reform, Public Education Association, 1988.

Peer, Gary G. — "The Status of Secondary School Guidance: A National Survey," in School Counselor, vol. 32, no.3, pp. 181-189, January 1985.

Texas Education Agency — Help for "At Risk" Children: School-Community Guidance Centers, Austin, January 1984.

Walz, Garry R. — "Current Issues and Trends in Guidance and Counseling," in Trends and Issues in Education, 19 pp., 1986.

Walz, Garry R., et. al. — Resources for Guidance Program Improvement. Volume I, National Institute of Education, Washington, DC, 1982.

Wilson, Natalie Susan — "Effects of a Classroom Guidance Unit on Sixth Graders' Examination Performance," in Journal of Humanistic Education and Development, vol 25, no. 2, pp. 70-79, December 1986.

Wysong, H. Eugene — "Needs Assessment in Counseling, Guidance, and Personnel Services. Searchlight Plus: Relevant Resources in High Interest Areas." National Institute of Education, Washington, DC, 1983.

Guidance systems in other states and cities that have been evaluated:

Cambridge, MA 1982 Teacher Advisor Program (TAP)
Strong multicultural emphasis, program designed to assist and support ninth grade students in their transition from grammar to high school. Program included group guidance, but its major focus was curricular.

Scarborough, Ontario 1982
Thoroughgoing internal evaluation of guidance in elementary and secondard schools. Includes a comprehensive research plan: purposes of study, definition of survey population, explanation of questionnaire development, plans for data collection and analysis, description of data reporting.

Eugene, OR 1983
Administrative history, staffing levels, content of school guidance activities in elementary and secondary schools. Found that schools with stable programs provided a broader range of services and more equitable distribution.

Texas 1984
Description of program and evaluation of state-legislated (1981) school-community guidance centers for at-risk students. Includes needs assessment, commitment, funding, facility and staff selection, program content, entrance and exit procedures, parental involvement, community support, follow-up services, evaluation.

Dade County, FL 1984
Junior and senior high school guidance investigation studied program activities, management, and impact. Problems were found in program management, but overall impact was positive.

Texas 1985
State evaluation of vocational guidance and counseling programs.